

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 608. APRIL 1956.

1. AMERICA AT CLOSE RANGE. By Marc T. Greene.
2. GEOFFREY DAWSON. By Captain A. L. Kennedy, M.C.
3. THE JEWS IN BRITAIN. By Israel Cohen.
4. CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT. By G. A. Campbell.
5. THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF REGULAR ENLISTMENTS. By Lt-Col. Frederic Evans, M.B.E., T.D.
6. LITERATURE VERSUS CELIBACY. By Marion Loch-head.
7. BERRIERS OF MOROCCO. By Ernest Gellner.
8. EVELYN'S DIARIES. By Arundell Eadaile, C.B.E., Litt.D.
9. THE SPAN OF A HISTORY. By A. MacC. Armstrong.
10. AFGHANISTAN AND RUSSIA. By Lt-Col. H. E. Crocker, C.M.G., D.S.O.
11. REDRAWING THE POLITICAL MAP OF INDIA. By Sir William Barton, K.C.I.E.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

Georgian Cabinet Makers—Reminiscences—Man on his Past.
The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship—Young
Samuel Johnson—New Hope in Africa—The Incomplete
Gardener—Excursion to Russia—Kuwait was my Home—
Kwame Nkrumah—The Foreseeable Future—Thackeray: The
Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846—Selected Literary Criticism—
Pope's Dandies—Amphibian: A Reconstruction of Browning
—An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England—The Colonial
Office—Questions in the House—Russian Holiday—Winston
Churchill—New Readings in Shakespeare.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
NEW YORK: THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY.
PRICE EIGHT SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.

3rd Printing

Strawberry Fair

A Biography of

Frances, Countess Waldegrave, 1821-1879

OSBERT WYNDHAM HEWETT

"I am sure Lady Waldegrave would have been devoted to Mr. Hewett. As we read this delightful book we slip softly into love with Lady Waldegrave ourselves."—Harold Nicolson in *The Observer*.

"The story of Lady Waldegrave is among the most astonishing in the social history of nineteenth century England, and her reputation is enhanced by the publication of this excellent and sympathetic biography."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"Mr. Hewett tells the story of her life with vivacity, wit and warm affection. And what a life she lived, full of passion and the wildest melodrama, prodigious, graceful, lit with gaiety and kindness and shot through with sombre tones of real anguish. It is Mr. Hewett's undoubted achievement to make comprehensible the quality in this astonishing woman that made so many people love her."—*The Evening News*.

"Mr. Hewett has found for his first book a really fascinating subject."—*Birmingham Post*.

With Illustrations 18s net

*'The best of our literary magazines,
by a long way.' — The Spectator*

THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE

has long been one of the finest mediums through which
the discerning reader may keep in touch with the best
in modern English literary trends

The current Spring Number contains:

FIRST EMBASSY	by Valentine Lawford
LIFTING STONE (A Poem)	by May Sarton
L'APRES-MIDI (A Story)	by Gabriel Fielding
LOTI-LAND (Illustrated)	by Lesley Blanch
KIPLING'S FIRST NOVEL	by Betty Miller
POEM	by Richard Church

*'It keeps discovering new purposes to which the
central tradition of English verse and prose can be
applied. In an age of exaggeration it maintains a
refreshing calm.'*—*The Times*.

*'In its pages sensibility, good taste, a feeling for
tradition and a zest for adventure peacefully co-
exist. Hearty congratulations upon its achievement.'*
—*Sunday Times*.

The ideal gift for ANY occasion

4 issues Inland for 11s. 6d. : Abroad 10s. 8d. ; 8 issues Inland
for 23s. : Abroad 21s. 4d. (inclusive of postage)

From your Bookseller or from 50 Albemarle Street, London, W.1.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

was established in 1809 and has seen the map of the world changed many times—as a whole and in its component parts. Always through the minds and pens of its contributors it has witnessed and recorded the progress in all departments of social, national, and international life.

A subscription to THE QUARTERLY enables you to keep in touch with this progress ; and a subscription taken out for a friend would prove a welcome and satisfying gift.

ORDER FORM

(Please detach)

Date.....

Please send **four** numbers of THE QUARTERLY REVIEW starting with the **current/forthcoming** number.

To.....

.....
 I enclose **Cheque/Postal Order** (Inland) for **36s. 6d.**: (Abroad) **35s. 6d.** which covers cost and postage.

From NAME

ADDRESS.....

.....
Please send this form to your Bookseller or to
50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1

TWILIGHT OF THE MAHARAJAS

by SIR KENNETH FITZE, K.C.I.E.

The author writes that he finds consolation for the austerities of later years in recording the delights and interests of by-gone times in India. He started his career there in the year of the Delhi Durbar, 1911. After some years spent in remote country districts he was transferred to the wonderland of the Indian states where he served for thirty years, including the last phase of Princely India. He experienced the decline from the glittering splendour of the Durbar to the relentless massacre of autocracy, which was officially admitted and described in the Government of India's White Paper of 1950—a grim process, which had been rendered almost inevitable by circumstances which the author has fully described. He also discusses the final collapse and reflects on how far their fate was justifiable, or inevitable. Here is valuable first-hand evidence for all interested in India, written with discernment and insight, and not lacking in the lighter side of life in India.

With Illustrations

15s net

HEFFER'S



**A CAMBRIDGE
BOOKSHOP
THAT IS KNOWN
IN ALL PARTS
OF THE WORLD**

•
W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
Petty Cury, Cambridge

INTO GOD

R. G. COULSON

An Exercise
in
Contemplation

9s. 6d. net

JOHN MURRAY

Elegant Flower

First Steps in China

by

DESMOND NEILL

In 1945, at the end of the war, Desmond Neill was an army officer in Malaya. He was so attracted to the country and its people that he decided to join the Malayan Civil Service as a career. He began in Singapore, where he was soon made aware of a real language barrier between himself and the bulk of the island's Chinese-speaking population. When, therefore, he was selected to be sent to Amoy to learn Hokkien, the predominant Chinese dialect in Singapore, he realised that this would provide a key to open up his new interests. And on his return to Singapore he was better equipped to understand the colourful kaleidoscope of the Chinatown that had once baffled him, as he sat in his favourite Chinese restaurant 'The Elegant Flower.'

In his book he describes his arrival in Amoy and how he set about learning Chinese under the guidance of his teacher Mr. Lim, an astonishing individual who is delightfully and sympathetically portrayed. But learning their language was only one facet of the task of understanding the Chinese, and as we follow the author's progress in his lessons we are introduced to much else about China and the Chinese; their every-day life, their art, poetry, food, marriage, politics and temples, about all of which he writes with an engaging sense of delicate situation, with humour, insight, and charm. He visits Shanghai, with its bustling crowds and contrasting night-life, Formosa, and Foochow, with its hot baths and proud tea-merchants, and he gives a most vivid and colourful description of Peking just before it fell to the Communists.

Autobiography and travel, amusement, fact and philosophy are blended with great skill and enjoyment to make a human and most penetrating picture of some of the personal problems of the West meeting the East.

With Illustrated Map 18s net

THE
QUARTERLY
REVIEW

No. 608.

PUBLISHED IN
APRIL 1956.

LONDON :
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.
1956



**but
what
can
I
do?**

The aged, the neglected, the erring need more than sympathy. The Army's "religion with hands" is ministering to their physical and spiritual needs.

But *you* can help by supporting this Christian service by gift or bequest.

Please send to 113, Queen Victoria Street,
London, E.C.4.

WHERE THERE'S NEED THERE'S

The Salvation Army

Made and Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, Limited,
London and Beccles, and published by JOHN MURRAY (Publishers) Limited.

CONTENTS

OF

No. 608.—APRIL 1956

ART.	PAGE
1. AMERICA AT CLOSE RANGE. By Marc T. Greene	141
2. GEOFFREY DAWSON. By Captain A. L. Kennedy, M.C. — — — — —	155
3. THE JEWS IN BRITAIN. By Israel Cohen — —	169
4. CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT. By G. A. Campbell	183
5. THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF REGULAR ENLISTMENTS. By Lt.-Col. Frederic Evans, M.B.E., T.D. —	193
6. LITERATURE VERSUS CELIBACY. By Marion Lochhead	207
7. BERBERS OF MOROCCO. By Ernest Gellner — —	218
8. EVELYN'S DIARIES. By Arundell Esdaile, C.B.E., Litt.D. — — — — —	224
9. THE SPAN OF A HISTORY. By A. MacC. Armstrong	232
10. AFGHANISTAN AND RUSSIA. By Lt.-Col. H. E. Crocker, C.M.G., D.S.O. — — — — —	238
11. REDRAWING THE POLITICAL MAP OF INDIA. By Sir William Barton, K.C.I.E. — — — — —	245
SOME RECENT BOOKS — — — — —	258

Georgian Cabinet Makers—Reminiscences—Man on his Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship—Young Samuel Johnson—New Hope in Africa—The Incomplete Gardener—Excursion to Russia—Kuwait was my Home—Kwame Nkrumah—The Foreseeable Future—Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846—Selected Literary Criticism—Pope's Dunciad—Amphibian: A Reconstruction of Browning—An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England—The Colonial Office—Questions in the House—Russian Holiday—Winston Churchill—New Readings in Shakespeare.


CONTENTS

No. 606.—OCTOBER 1955.

1.	The Situation in the United States	425
2.	Dead Reckoning for the Ship of State	439
3.	Spain. The Loss of a Friend	451
4.	Gladstone as a 'Quarterly Review' Contributor	464
5.	Two Minor Victorian Novelists: Lady Georgiana Fullerton and Mrs Norton	477
6.	A Woodman's Birds	486
7.	Byron and the Stage	496
8.	The Web of Life	504
9.	Lamennais	512
10.	Germany, Austria and Central Europe: A Historical Retrospect	526
11.	Thomas Gray	540
	W. S. to Stratford, Conn.	547
	Some Recent Books	548

No. 607.—JANUARY 1956.

1.	French Migraine	1
2.	The General Election and After	17
3.	The Canadian Political Situation	31
4.	Arnold and Oxford	44
5.	The Scientific Revolution	55
6.	The Care of Archives	66
7.	The History of Home Rule from the Introduction of the First Bill in 1886, down to the Ireland Act of 1949	77
8.	Italy's Surplus Population	83
9.	Women in Association	97
10.	The Changing Art of Advocacy	105
11.	The Racial Clue in History	119
	Some Recent Books	128

 THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published in January, April, July, and October.

Price Thirty-five Shillings and Sixpence per Annum, *post free*.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 608.—APRIL 1956

Art. 1.—AMERICA AT CLOSE RANGE.

As the position is at the moment, anything that affects America affects the world, indirectly if not directly. That should be understood at the outset. Therefore, conditions in America are of world interest and world import. If America prospers it is well for the world, from both economic and political viewpoints. The defence of much of the world against a potential enemy probing everywhere for weak points is sustained or maintained by America. Whether the free world likes it or not, America is the present bulwark of that world. If her prosperity is menaced, or her capacity for aid of various kinds to those in need, or if for any reason or out of any cause ultra-nationalism as continually urged by certain leaders should gain the upper hand and America decide to 'go it on her own,' then the potential enemy is all but certain to become the actual one, very likely indeed to strike.

If this is not over-stating the position, and most people conversant with the actual facts of that position will surely agree that it is not, then it is of the utmost concern to the whole world to know just how America stands, what exactly is the truth of the much-vaunted 'unprecedented prosperity' and whether it is likely to endure, under what conditions the American people are living, how they regard the rest of the world and the dependence, direct or indirect, of so much of it upon them, and to what degree the materialism that always has and always must be fostered and encouraged by a rapid increase in material aggrandisement is affecting the cultural and spiritual values that, in the long run, may determine the destiny of any people.

That materialism *is* affecting cultural and spiritual values no one viewing the American scene at all objectively can doubt. A rapid increase in material wealth is dangerous for the average person, and it is dangerous, not only for

Vol. 294.—No. 608.

the average nation but for any nation. To a nation it brings great power, and it is only repeating a truism to remind that great power always corrupts. America's present power is perhaps greater than that of any nation in history since Rome at the zenith of her might. Rome's power maintained for a time a world peace, maintained it by compelling it. The parallel between that position and the present is too close to be evaded or disregarded.

America's power, her world prestige, have been gained in a far shorter period of time than was Rome's, her rise to enormous wealth, vast productive capacity, and a dominant place among the nations has been at a dizzying pace. Is her spiritual stability firm enough to maintain her balance?

America's achievement of dominant power and vast wealth has come within hardly more than half a century, indeed the greater part of it since the first world war. History holds no parallel to this. To contemplate it bewilders thought and staggers the imagination. It also tends to obscure the sharply defined line between material and spiritual progress and to create in the average mind a disregard of the history-proven fact that a material progress that submerges the cultural and spiritual is no foundation for a secure and enduring future, but a house built upon shifting sand. All these, of course, are generalisations, their value dependent upon inescapable facts. Let us, then, proceed to gather these facts.

There is a general sentiment among the American people that they are being over-taxed in order to 'support' much of the rest of the world. They are convinced that the English, in particular, 'do not work hard enough.' This opinion is based on reports of frequent strikes and is fostered by certain organisations hostile to Britain in principle, by sundry anti-English individuals, and by such newspapers as the Chicago 'Tribune.'

Intelligent Americans, however, understand that whatever aid their country has extended Britain is far from being an altruistic policy. Rather it is one of self-protection, inasmuch as America's eastern frontier, or first line of defence, is obviously in Europe.

But the present American budget allocates to general defence purposes, mostly of a military nature, about one-third of the total. Funds presently available for military

assistance, mutual-defence financing, special economic assistance, and other purposes of the Mutual Security programme, total upwards of 7,000,000,000\$. Foreign aid amounted, in 1954, to about 10 per cent. of all American taxes, approximately the foregoing sum. Of this Britain has received, since the war, more than a billion a year. France has received about three-fourths of that sum, West Germany half, Italy slightly less. Of the two billions, more or less, given to Greece, most went to the support of the army of 160,000 men maintained along the northern borders. Japan had a couple of billions and China—that is to say, Chiang Kai-shek—only slightly less. The total figure in respect of foreign aid since the war, upwards of fifty billions of dollars, rather staggers the American imagination. Nevertheless, there is no definite or important opposition to continued foreign aid, either economic or military. It is not, on the whole, a main political issue, or likely to be in the coming Presidential campaign. Generally speaking, the Democrats take a broader view of the position, and Adlai E. Stevenson, the probable Democratic candidate for the Presidency this year, is a firm friend of Britain, a man of liberal and objective thought, and in the best and broadest sense an internationalist. He is 100 per cent. against the isolationist concept.

There is, then, no doubt that American aid will go on, whatever its effect upon the American tax-payer. Increasingly hard-pressed as he is, he realises that world-leadership is a costly thing, but he is, on the whole, prepared to pay the cost. He is bitterly opposed to 'Communism,' which in the main he interprets, not as necessarily having anything to do with Karl Marx, or with Marxian teachings—few Americans have any acquaintance with either—but as an organised and uncompromising opposition to the democratic idea or ideal of government. Its possible ascendancy, as an alternative to a continued outpouring of American money for foreign military and economic aid, is quite sufficient to keep him passive in the face of continued, or even increased, expenditures.

Americans are being told that the present 'boom' is not only unprecedented in history, American or any other, but that it is providing them with the highest standard of living ever known anywhere. That swells their pride and quiets their doubts, if any. Doubts, in fact, are few. They are

considered unpatriotic, un-American. They are, as the late J. P. Morgan once said, 'selling America short.'

Purchases of everything on earth are at a higher level than ever heard of before anywhere. 'Big business' men talk airily in terms of billions. Both industries and utilities are making so much money that they are increasing dividends every day and 'splitting' stocks. When this happens the stock goes up, until at this writing the New York Stock Exchange averages are almost unprecedentedly high. Yet that some stocks are too high is obvious. DuPont, with a dividend of 7 per cent., is selling at around 240, and the Santé Fe Railway, paying 5 per cent., is at 150. On the other hand, American Telephone & Telegraph, paying 9 per cent., and regarded as about the 'safest' of all, sells at 180 or thereabouts.

But the condition that causes doubt, grave doubt, in the minds of thoughtful and more far-sighted people is the credit condition, the fact that more than two-thirds of all purchases, from motor-cars to round-the-world tours, are being made on credit. The vast amount owed by the American people in this 'mortgaging of the future' now passes fifty billions of dollars!

Yet that this is a dangerous condition—as would certainly appear to the average person—is vehemently denied by those who profit by it. One 'authority' holds that to double even such a vast sum would not be threatening to the country's economy.

Conservative economists, however, are concerned with the credit position. It relates to necessities as well as to luxuries. For example, two-thirds of the homes of the American people are said to be mortgaged. It is impossible to confirm the absolute accuracy of this, but it is certainly not far from the fact. On the luxury side, though to the American his motor-car is not a luxury but a necessity, something like four-fifths of these have been purchased on the credit system. This system has gone to incredible extremes. One can buy a car for a 'down' payment of as low as ten dollars. Television, as necessitous to the American home to-day as the motor-car, is secured, as to more than four-fifths of its numbers, by initial payments of a dollar, and half that, or even in many cases a quarter—twenty-five cents—a week!

It is this kind of buying that is swelling the sales of

huge corporations like General Motors, which last year disposed of more than fifteen billions of dollars' worth of its widely varied and innumerable products, a record never before heard of in America or anywhere else. At a conservative estimate, more than three-fourths of this incredible business was credit business.

Now whether all this constitutes a boom-to-the-point-of-bust condition is a matter of hotly debated opinion. Comparisons with 1929—when the stock-market crash resounded around the world—are misleading, inasmuch as then all stocks were far ahead of their dividend earnings, the rate of interest was lower than now, and shares could be acquired by a ten-per-cent. down payment. To-day only a few stocks sell at prices disproportionate to their earnings, while 80 per cent. of their value must be paid to acquire them. There is even talk of increasing this to 90 per cent. so as to forestall any more 'crashes.'

Yet even stocks can be bought on credit, though possession does not come except with the full amount. Credit, indeed, is the *leit motif* of American business to-day. It is possible to 'buy' a tour around the world or anywhere in it for payments of twenty to forty dollars a month, and this is sending more Americans afield than ever before, greatly to the benefit of many countries. Last year Americans spent more than 300,000,000\$ in Europe and the Mediterranean area. This year it is expected that this amount will be greatly increased.

The foregoing, economically sound or otherwise, is one side of the picture of 'glowing prosperity' in the United States of America. What is the other?

It may be surprising to many people in other countries that there is any other. The statement, bruited abroad with singular persistency and systematic dissemination, that America's living-standard is the highest in the world—which, incidentally, is not true—leads to the conclusion that the admittedly high standard applies to everybody, that there is little or no actual poverty, that wages in all lines of endeavour are high, and that meat is on every table at least twice a day. Let us come to grips with the facts.

A Government agency has lately made public figures indicating the extent of 'poverty in America.' No doubt English people will read this with astonishment. Is there, then, such a thing?

Fifty-five per cent. of American families have an income of under 3000\$ a year. Between 2000\$ and 5000\$ is called the 'middle-income group.' Above this is the 'high-income group,' below it the 'low-income group.' Thirty per cent. of the people are in the high-income group, and 5000\$ a year is the absolute minimum at which, costs being what they are to-day, an American family of, say, four can exist in even a moderate degree of comfort and economic security, being equipped with motor-car, television—often two sets in the same house—and all the numberless 'gadgets' of 'modern' housekeeping.

Out of such an income taxes may amount to from five hundred to a thousand dollars. It is estimated that one-third of the remainder is, on the average, owing for goods bought on credit. Often this amount may be as high as two-thirds.

Some 15 per cent. of the American people, roughly 24,000,000, are found by this official survey to exist on incomes of under a thousand dollars a year. Obviously this is not prosperity, 'glowing' or otherwise. It relates largely to people in the Southern states, and of those mainly to share-croppers, the majority of whom are coloured.

'Share-cropping' is one of the worst banes, also perils, of the American economy. It is a good deal like the old 'landlordism' in China and other oriental countries. The worker gathers the crop, mostly cotton in the American South, on shares, and all manner of elements, chiefly weather conditions, may and do determine the scale of his existence. At best it is a marginal existence. At worst it may be semi-starvation, mitigated only by Government aid. A recent study of the Agricultural Department has shown that more than 80 per cent. of non-white families in the United States are in the low-income—under 1000\$ a year—group, and no less than 42 per cent. of white farm-workers and operators.

This revelation has come as something of a shock to the American people generally, and it certainly will be a surprise abroad. Yet it is the information of the Government's own investigators, who are not likely to be unduly pessimistic.

But by no means all the 'low-income group' are country-dwellers. On the contrary, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation has reported that 10 per cent. of all

city households have 'low economic status,' with double that number of non-white city dwellers in the same condition. Twenty-seven per cent. of all farm families in the country had under 2000\$ a year income. Moreover, during the past eight years it has been found that the condition of the number of people with 'permanently inadequate economic resources'—that is, under 2000\$ a year—has shown no material improvement.

Between twenty and twenty-five million people out of an estimated total of approximately 160,000,000 are, then, not enjoying 'unprecedented American prosperity,' or any prosperity at all. Many of them, indeed, are desperately poor. Even the most casual survey of the country confirms this. As you go about you are astonished at the number of caravan—'trailers,' they are called here—dwellings, sometimes whole communities numbering up to a thousand people. Some of the caravans are quite roomy and even luxurious; more vary from habitable down to wretched. Yet there are few who lack their television apparatus, generally set on the ground beside the caravan, and more often than not a motor-car stands at hand. The caravan-dwellers probably work in adjacent industries, receiving in pay from thirty to seventy-five dollars a week, and their motor-cars are being paid for at the rate of five dollars weekly out of that, and maybe a dollar or even less for the wireless instrument.

The slums of many of the American cities are quite as appalling as those in England. Los Angeles, in these days generally enveloped in what is known as 'smog,' mostly poisonous emanations from the tall chimneys of numberless works and already proven to be highly detrimental to health, makes one of the worst impressions as you approach it of any city, not only in America but in the entire world. Yet the difference between the slums of Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, St Louis, Baltimore, or Cleveland is only one of degree. And in these slums live hundreds of thousands of the aforesaid people of 'permanently inadequate economic resources.' These are not likely to possess motor-cars or television, but they pretty certainly have some sort of wireless. What comes over it, from commentators 'sponsored' by cigarette-manufacturers, motor-car dealers, vendors of tooth-paste, razor-blades, synthetic ice-cream, or anti-cold tablets, establishes the groundwork

of the thought of these low-income-group listeners on every subject.

That means standardised thinking. It means the atrophy through non-use of men's capacity for thought. It means intellectual regimentation, and that is one of the greatest of presently manifest menaces to the future of America.

The existing media of news-dissemination and of propaganda is so extensive and so inclusive as to control the thought of the majority of the people. 'Why,' one man demanded, 'should I bother my head with thinking about troubles in the Middle East, or trying to figure out how to end the cold war, when "Time" and the "Reader's Digest" tell me all about it.' He might well have added 'and what to think about it.'

All, or almost all, the American magazines are 'bullish' on America and anything that concerns it. They talk of the 'revolution by prosperity,' the 10,000\$ homes of returned service men, the opulence of 'super-markets,' and the sixty million motor-cars. They marvel at what has come to pass and congratulate the Almighty on His wisdom in thus favouring America. But they say nothing of the mortgages on those 10,000\$ homes, the forty or fifty million of those motor-cars unpaid for (many will *never* be paid for), the twenty millions of 'permanent economic inadequacy' who rarely see the inside of a super-market, or the hundreds of thousands of poverty-stricken ill and maimed who lack the means of providing themselves with medical care. To call attention to any of this, to insist that the future of the nation, possibly its very existence *as* a nation, depends upon its rectification, is to 'sell America short,' and is the worst of calumny, if not treason.

But the thought-regimentation process has gone much further than a mere 'boosting' of America and an insistence that there is no flaw in the mechanism of prosperity nor qualification to the fairy-like story of incredible abundance for all. It is a process that assumes a much more dangerous aspect, a far more menacing tendency, when it imperils the present and threatens the future of the country by demanding that the common thought-trend follow a fixed and well-defined political line, a line from which deviation is 'disloyalty' and of which non-acceptance is a 'danger to the national security.'

Of all the threats to the future of America—and as threats to America perhaps also to the rest of the world—concerning the thought of serious people at the moment, the two that give rise to the most apprehension are undoubtedly the appalling spread of materialism and the organised and systematic endeavour to regiment and control the national thought on all matters.

Many people feel that the American Government has set up a national system of 'internal security' that is becoming more powerful and having a more direct influence on their daily lives than the Government itself. In one way or another, directly or indirectly, the acts and words and, so far as they can be determined, even the thoughts of every citizen are under scrutiny. Much is made in America of the limitation to freedom of speech in Soviet-controlled countries, yet it is the fact that in America to-day, vaunted land of freedom in all its phases and in all concerns, the citizen must watch his words in case he thinks to criticise the Government or any of its activities or to take a stand contrary to the well-channelled trend of popular thought, or to express disapproval of any phase of the 'American way of life.' One man, in California, queried about the Government's policy along these lines, commenced a criticism that was obviously spontaneous and sincere. Then, realising that he was talking with a stranger who, for all he knew, might be a Government agent—they are everywhere and in all guises—suddenly checked himself. 'Guess I better not say any more,' he lamented.

How many people are at present being 'investigated' by the various 'security' agencies and how many more are in peril of being?

There are 2,500,000 Federal employees. These must all be 'clear' if they are to retain their jobs. Failure to be 'clear' can be the result of such apparent privileges of any citizen as being a subscriber to the 'Nation' or to the 'New Republic'—weeklies approximating in editorial policy and news-content to the 'New Statesman and Nation'—being a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, or of any one of more than 250 organisations listed by the Attorney-General of the United States as 'subversive.' One must be very careful in one's speech lest some informer he does not suspect report him to the 'security' investigators. This applies practically to

everybody, not only to those having some Federal position. Several millions in industrial occupations must have 'clearances': if these cannot be obtained employment usually is terminated; also all people, men and women alike, connected with the United Nations Organisations, everybody in the armed services, or the merchant-marine, all totalling by authoritative estimates around one-eighth of the entire population. The amazing extreme to which this sort of thing can go, and does go, is illustrated convincingly in one instance. The Washington Book-shop, located in Washington Square, New York City, has for sale or for lending a certain amount of Soviet literature, also books and articles by such American 'subversives' as Upton Sinclair, Roger Baldwin (Director of the American Civil Liberties Union), Louis Fischer (long a foreign correspondent of the 'Nation'), Anna Louise Strong, Frieda Utey, and Henry Wallace. Also—of course—Dr Hewlett Johnson. Any person known to have patronised this shop regularly or to have held a library-card in it at any time during the past eight years is in grave danger of having his—or her—'security clearance' refused. Such refusal means loss of an existing position or failure to obtain another.

Is this a violation of the most fundamental concept of the thing called 'liberty,' as most American liberals maintain? 'In this Republic,' declared former Senator from the State of Washington, Harry P. Cain, in a notable speech not long ago, 'the Government represents, acts and speaks for us, its people. It continues for us, the people, to petition the Government . . . to provide a climate in which the individual is self-reliant, self-respecting—and free!'

Curious as it may seem, a citizen's attitude toward the China question and whether the Government should recognise Communist China and refuse longer to supply Chiang Kai-shek with millions of the American tax-payers' money, is regarded as a kind of test of his 'loyalty.' Loyalty to *America*—not to Chiang. No Federal employee, for example, could expect to hold his position for a day after he had been heard to question either the withholding of a *de facto* recognition of the existing Government of the Chinese Republic or the continued generous contributions to the exile in Formosa.

It was along these lines that both Dr Owen Lattimore, eminent and respected member of the Faculty of the eminent and respected University of Johns Hopkins, at Baltimore, and high-level diplomat John Carter Vincent came to grief.

Dr Lattimore, who is Director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations, urged a political set-up in China after the war that should at least modify the ruthless authoritarianism of the Kuomintang and at the same time prevent the country's falling into Communism. No more a Communist or a sympathiser therewith than any of his persecutors, Dr Lattimore's real work was to struggle against Communist accession in China. For some years, indeed, he was an adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, having been so appointed by President Roosevelt. But, as he himself told the present writer, he did not continue as a 'Formosa Firster.' The result has been that, although recently cleared, he was compelled to spend years out of his academic career—though Johns Hopkins has been loyal to him throughout, kept his place open for him on the Faculty, and even continued his salary—and a large sum of money, for counsel and otherwise, in his defence against the preposterous charge of being a Communist.

John Carter Vincent, whose last—and apparently final—diplomatic post was American Minister at Tangier, was summarily discharged by Secretary of State Dulles. He was supposed to have had a 'Communist-tainted' past. The fact, of course, is that he had opposed the present 'Nationalist' régime in China.

But as an example of the gross injustice of the business of 'spotting' a Communist, Dr Lattimore's is impressive. One of his immediate colleagues, a friend as he had supposed, turned out to be an informer, both to Senator McCarthy and to the Federal Bureau of Information. It was by this method that much of the 'evidence' used against Dr Lattimore in the course of his various hearings and trials and re-trials was obtained. His is by no means, though perhaps the most publicised, the only one of the ordeals well-known American scholars have had to face in order to prove their 'loyalty' and exempt themselves from suspicion of being 'security risks.' One well-known professor in a leading university—not, of course, possible to name—characterised the position in these words: 'What is going

on to-day does not divide the academics from the rest of society. It divides the brave and the honest, the would-be brave and the not-quite-honest, the frightened and the bewildered, the vicious and the pathological.'

The fact is, of course, that the 'Communist' bogey stalks everywhere. It haunts the halls of thought of every American. It is the one fearsome foe of America's continued world supremacy and world power. It sees in America its greatest—if not its only—obstacle to its own world supremacy. It has—so the general conviction goes—its tentacles in every phase of American life, in Government, in industry, in the professions, in the colleges and schools, and in the arts. Aye, even in sport. Therefore it is the manifest duty of every good citizen to keep a watchful eye upon every other citizen who, by reason of his declared opinions, his reading, his associates, and his activities, may be suspected of being or of becoming a possible 'security risk.' The extent to which this has gone is well illustrated by a recent incident. The F.B.I. issued a pamphlet on 'How to Spot a Communist.' One method, the pamphlet explained, was to watch for a man who used 'too serious language' and 'too big words.' 'Such phrases as "dialectical materialism," "economic security," "unearned increment," "surplus production," generally indicate a man with Communist leanings.' One was reminded of Cæsar regarding Cassius: 'He thinks too much. Such men are dangerous.' But the American Civil Liberties Union promptly 'went to bat,' as the Americans say, on this issue, with the result that the pamphlet was withdrawn. Commenting on this, the ultra-patriotic 'American Legion Magazine' observed, 'The American Civil Liberties Union appears to be controlling the F.B.I.'

Another spectre disturbing the slumbers of Americans, especially those associated with large industry, is the spectre of increasing Russian world trade. For the keystone of American power is her export trade. It amounts to upwards of five billions of dollars of excess of exports over imports. The United Kingdom takes between 4 and 5 per cent. of these exports and the balance-of-trade favours America to the extent of more than 150,000,000*l.* annually. Curiously enough, the largest import from America is machinery. The largest export item to America is vehicles.

American export productivity is enormous. Each

post-war year it has more than doubled that of any year prior to the war. The increased industrial potential of the United States fairly dwarfs the progress achieved in England. For example, while coal-production in Britain has barely held its own in the past ten years, in America it has expanded more than 25 per cent. Industrial consumption of raw cotton, which in England fell off disastrously between 1938 and 1952, in America increased during the same period more than 20 per cent.

The agricultural picture is not so bright and this will be one of the important issues of the 1956 Presidential campaign. America has been exporting between twenty and twenty-two million tons of foodstuffs during the past half-dozen years, but the amount has decreased during the past three, and the fall in farm prices is a serious matter and is bringing the farmers—there are five and a half million farms in the United States, totalling 1,333,000,000 acres of land—to a dim view of the Republican Administration.

Enormous food surpluses are being held in storage and the present policy of the Government is to withhold their sale on world markets at competitive prices. Yet the Government has continued to urge expanded food production. The farmers have responded, and now the result of that response finds no sale because there is too much in America already and the surplus cannot be sold abroad. This applies especially to cotton, which the Government does not offer in world trade at a price lower than the domestic support figure. Therefore, the cotton acreage is shrinking and the reduction last year alone resulted, according to James L. Whitten, Chairman of the House Agricultural Appropriation Committee, in the loss of their homes to more than 55,000 families.

America's future, then, is not necessarily any more secure than that of a good deal of the rest of the world. The Americans, generous by disposition as they are, are unlikely to demand any material changes in the long-sustained programme of foreign aid, both military and economic. If Mr Eisenhower 'chooses' to run and is re-elected, as he probably will be, or if he doesn't and the Democratic candidate, probably Mr Stevenson, is elected, neither result will greatly alter America's foreign policy, assuming a continuance of the present position in respect of the 'cold war.'

Dangers lie nearer at home, and one of the greatest of these is that, as the very conservative 'U.S. News and World Report' says, 'Too many Americans are living beyond their incomes.' This is due to the easy extension of credit, for the average American, less provident than the Englishman or the Frenchman, must have the latest, the most 'modern,' of everything, whether he can pay for it or not. This easy credit inevitably means inflation of the national economy, and that is very definitely the present position. It is hardly to be supposed that such a position can maintain indefinitely. And so, notwithstanding all the publicity about 'golden prosperity,' 'sitting on top of the world,' and so on, the future of America, to seriously thinking people, is shrouded in no little uncertainty.

MARC T. GREENE.

Art. 2.—GEOFFREY DAWSON.

FEW PEOPLE, I suppose, can have made so few mistakes in a long career of public service as Geoffrey Dawson ; and very seldom can a single error of judgment, committed near the end of it, have so completely ruined a reputation till then very great. The greatness of his success indeed made the greatness of his failure. His two editorships had by the middle thirties accustomed the country to believe that the line of policy advocated by 'The Times' was the right line. G.D. reached his high-water mark of influence at the time of the abdication in 1936, in which he is by general consent considered to have played a part second only to Baldwin's by rallying a puzzled and divided public opinion to the Prime Minister's support. When, therefore, during the three following years he took the line that a clear understanding with Germany was the one sure way of preserving peace the public, apart from a clear-sighted minority, thought that he was right. No editor can do more than to sway a groping, evenly balanced public opinion one way or the other, and it is very doubtful whether even his accumulated authority could have brought the country round to oppose the policy of appeasement of Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain. In any case 'The Times' under G.D. supported both of them ; and when that policy failed—though not before—prevalent opinion made Chamberlain and Dawson the two principal scapegoats.*

And Printing House Square inadvertently contributed to the disrepute of one who will probably be ranked among the ablest and most efficient editors who has presided over the fortunes of 'The Times' in 170 years. The last volume of the 'History of The Times' was compiled and published during the immediate post-war years and set out most plainly the mistaken judgment of the Editor and Assistant-Editor in regard to Germany, just at the moment when the causes of the Second World War were being most actively canvassed. G.D.'s head was offered to the public on a platter. The 'History' did, of course, contain an account of all that he had done for the paper during his

* It is interesting to note that Dawson's predecessor Delane was made the scapegoat by Kinglake for 'hounding the country into war against Russia' in 1854.

twenty-seven years of editorship, but the reviewers, with their flair for the topical, turned with one accord to his policy of appeasement and condemned him as a failure.

Let us see what he had accomplished before that time. His achievements all emerge clearly from the valuable addendum to 'The Times History' which has been compiled by Sir Evelyn Wrench,* and all whose work or other interests brought them into contact with G.D. in his many activities will be grateful to Sir Evelyn for the efficient manner in which he has completed his labour of love.

When G.D. became Editor for the first time in 1912 Lord Milner wrote to him: 'On the whole, I don't think there is a finer chance in the whole sphere of public affairs.' Lord Northcliffe had just taken over the paper and, according to one of G.D.'s early entries in his diary, 'the Chief' (as he liked to be called) 'was in an impossible state of nerves and contradictory suggestions.' Month by month the Chief pushed 'The Times' towards the 'Daily Mail' and the 'Daily Mail' towards 'The Times.' G.D. therefore had to deal with a master who was a man of moods and who was frequently trying to lead him whither he would not go. Both men, however, faced the first great national crisis, caused by the invasion of Belgium by Germany, in complete agreement; and supported by Wickham Steed's expert knowledge of all the issues involved they rallied public opinion to stand four-square behind Belgium and France, as Grey rallied Parliament and the divided Cabinet. Dawson was one of the first to detect the unsuitability of Asquith to lead a nation in war; he promoted the idea of a small War Cabinet and a change of leader; and, when Lloyd George took over, it was G.D.'s personal intervention that brought about the fruitful combination of Milner with the new Prime Minister—a combination which in the crisis of 1918 led to the supreme command of the Allied armies being given to Foch. But by 1918 Northcliffe was informing G.D. that 'The Times' was regarded as his (Northcliffe's) 'personal voice in every quarter of the world'; and Steed was writing leading articles in the 'Daily Mail' as well as 'The Times.' G.D., whose sleep for the only time in his life

* *Geoffrey Dawson and Our Times* by Sir Evelyn Wrench (Hutchinson).

was deserting him, felt that it was time to go. He formally resigned in February 1919. On Feb. 25 he received a letter from Lord Stamfordham informing him that King George V 'had heard with much regret of his retirement from the important position of Editor of "The Times." . . . The King much appreciates [so the letter continued] your friendly and considerate assistance which could always be relied upon.' Dawson declined the Honour which the Prime Minister proposed for him.

When the Northcliffe-Steed regime collapsed, the new proprietors had not a moment's hesitation in recalling G.D.—'a most depressing prospect' he notes in his diary, for he was leading a full and happy life, with sufficient work to keep him pleasantly occupied and which did not involve late hours. Moreover, he was now married to the lady who brought a new graciousness into his life. However, back he went to P.H.S., only making the condition that in future the Editor, and the Editor alone, should be responsible for the policy of the paper—the proprietors of course retaining the right to dismiss him and to appoint a successor. In a memorandum which he drew up for his own guidance about this time he set out that his object on 'The Times' would be: (1) to reflect and guide public opinion, (2) to make money by producing a profitable newspaper.

He completely succeeded in both these purposes. Northcliffe had at first enormously increased the circulation of 'The Times,' especially during the few months before 1914 when the price was reduced to 1d.; but by 1922, when Dawson resumed the editorship, the numbers sold had run down to a quite unprofitable level, and in 1920–21 it neither reflected nor guided public opinion. G.D.'s first success on resuming direction was to restore the circulation, to re-establish a live contact with the Government and with public opinion, and to bring back prosperity to the proprietors. Congratulatory letters were soon pouring in. 'A few lines of warm congratulation upon the wonderful recovery "The Times" has made,' wrote Lord Long. 'That is a most remarkable article of yours in yesterday's "Times"—the "Thunderer" of Delane's day redivivus' came from Lord Esher. And Mrs Asquith, who certainly had no reason to thank G.D. for his attitude in 1916, wrote: 'We all think you have

done wonders with "The Times," transforming it from the worst sort of wrong-headedness into the great paper it was.'

Having saved 'The Times' from becoming an instrument of personal influence and aggrandisement, he soon derived considerable amusement from helping to frustrate an attempt by two Press Lords to launch a new political Party. Lords Beaverbrook and Rothermere decided to run a 'limited Empire Party.' G.D. had great fun in placing side by side in the paper the story of the two noblemen busy with their new political escapade and the escape of two monkeys from the Zoo. The joke was taken up by several other newspapers and the new Party disappeared in a cloud of ridicule within a month.

One of the services which 'The Times' was able to render with the renewal of its 'pulling-power,' as G. D. used to call it, was the provision of money for the much-needed restoration of St Paul's Cathedral. Within a week of the launching of the appeal 74,000*l.* had been brought in, and two weeks later the sum had risen to 200,000*l.*

Here it may also be mentioned that G.D. was responsible for introducing a cross-word puzzle into the columns of 'The Times,' for having a full page devoted to pictures, and (with the expert help of Stanley Morison) transforming the typographical appearance of the paper. The ornamental Gothic title on the front page was abolished, and there, and all through the paper, was substituted a new type specially designed in Printing House Square. Under G.D.'s auspices, moreover, the Light Leaders took a new form, which has continued ever since—on what I would call the Douglas Woodruff pattern.*

In the critical year 1931, when the country went off the gold standard and the Labour Government resigned, G.D. was able in 'The Times' to rally public opinion to the idea of an all-Party National Government. Ramsay MacDonald was to lead it, and one had already been hastily formed. But after taking one of his brief holidays in Yorkshire, where he 'thought things out best,' he decided that the National Government must be approved by the country, and although many people considered that the re-formed Administration was good enough and that an election might produce a stalemate, G.D. returned to P.H.S. with the conviction that an election was necessary

* Charles Morgan too occasionally contributed a 'fourth leader.'

and that the MacDonald-Baldwin partnership would gain an overwhelming victory. As usual, his judgment in home affairs was correct, and the result was just such as he had foreseen. It was about this time that he became an intimate counsellor and sometimes prompter of Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain. On this occasion he was also rung up from Buckingham Palace by Lord Stamfordham, who wished to have his view to lay before the King—His Majesty being due to receive MacDonald, Baldwin, and Samuel later in the day. Baldwin on his part went round to G.D.'s house in Sussex Place and spent the morning with him, and could not be found by Buckingham Palace—he had wanted to see the Editor of 'The Times' before he went to see the King. A few days later G.D. was invited to go and have luncheon with the Prime Minister at Chequers. 'The Times' rallied a wavering public in a manner which John Buchan—critical in many other respects of its policy—called 'the very best thing done in British journalism for many a day.' 'Bravo, "The Times"! ' wrote Thomas Marlowe, who had recently retired from the editorship of the 'Daily Mail.'

Some people may question the advisability of the editor of a newspaper becoming so personally intimate with the political leaders of the day, but I would suggest that the advantages outweigh the obvious disadvantages. And in the mind of the community the credit went to 'The Times'—not to its Editor, who remained incognito to them. Even his own staff knew very little about the personal interviews he was having in high places.

Throughout this period—approximately 1927 to 1936—Geoffrey Dawson and 'The Times' worked ardently for a settlement with India and Pakistan on the lines advocated by the Simon Commission and then by the British Government. G.D. stood metaphorically at the side of Stanley Baldwin and helped him to rebut the pungently die-hard views of Winston Churchill. G.D. also went out to India and stayed for ten days with his close friend the Viceroy, Lord Irwin as he then was. He travelled about a good deal and even sent back some messages 'from our Special Correspondent.' He sometimes sat with the Viceroy going through the drafts of his speeches or despatches with him; and he notes on one occasion 'we removed a phrase about Dominion status'—full independence not being under

consideration at that time. When he returned he wrote with his own hand leader after leader on India, and Sir Evelyn Wrench is probably right when he says that without the wholehearted backing of 'The Times' the White Paper would never have been accepted by the majority of the Conservative Party.

I remember driving home with G.D. in the office car one night in the summer of 1936 when he told me that Mr Baldwin was anxious to retire, but had told him that before he resigned he hoped to do two things—to bring France and Germany together and to see the young King firmly seated on the throne. Clio has surely a sense of irony all of her own!... In this same year the abdication of Edward VIII was the peak in the graph of G.D.'s influence on public opinion—though the result was exactly the opposite of what the Prime Minister had set out to achieve. Mention has already been made of this tragic but beneficent crisis in British history, in which public sentiment was deeply but variously concerned. A strong lead by 'The Times' might have turned majority opinion towards a morganatic marriage and the retention of King Edward on the throne. But G.D., powerfully influenced by the views which flowed into P.H.S. from the Dominions and United States, resolutely supported his friend Stanley Baldwin in the policy which the Prime Minister had himself reluctantly adopted.

'To reflect and guide public opinion'—that had been his own slightly paradoxical axiom; but he could claim that the paper under his direction had steadily and successfully performed the task in home and Imperial affairs. G.D. was an adept at taking the pulse of political opinion in high places and among average citizens. He supplemented a natural instinct by shooting questions at his acquaintances in the clubs, in the House, and in the office, and getting their reactions almost before they had had time to formulate or express their answers. I remember him coming into the room in P.H.S. which I shared with a colleague in 1940, when he told us that Chamberlain was resigning. 'Halifax' (pause) 'or Churchill,' he said as he passed out—looking at us hard in turn; and left the room before we had time to say anything, but knowing that we were surprised when he mentioned Halifax and relieved when he added 'or Churchill.' His method succeeded

admirably where the British public had themselves the right instinct, but in foreign affairs it failed, because there instinct is not enough. Some knowledge of past history and of the varied characteristics and likely reactions of different races is obviously necessary before a sound judgment can be formed, the reactions of other nations being different from ours. Some Englishmen, even untravelled Englishmen, have a certain feel for European affairs; the majority, however, have not, and G.D., 'reflecting' public opinion and having no particular knowledge of Europe, was in with the majority. He must have been well enough aware of his own earlier lack of interest in Europe, but when in the later thirties international problems provided the vital issues, he gaily devoted himself to them and faithfully reflected the outlook of the average man.

It was unfortunate indeed for the country that during that period the two men at the head of affairs were precisely of the same type and outlook—Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain had both been successful in home politics, both had critical foreign problems to deal with, and both took the line of the average man in regard to them.*

Abyssinia provided the first big foreign issue in which G.D. himself—with the close support of Barrington-Ward—gave the lead to the paper. Let us imagine that a Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary in the position—the undemocratic position—of Lord Salisbury had had to deal with it. Surely he would have said to himself something like this: 'It's a clear case of wanton aggression. Certainly the League of Nations ought to intervene, and to stop it if it can. If it cannot, we must make our protest, but keep out. Can it stop Italy? If the United States, Germany, and Russia would combine with us to do it, no doubt we should be successful. But they will not. Of the Great Powers, only France, and she half-heartedly. And the one "sanction" that would be decisive would be an embargo on oil. If Russia and U.S.A.

* It is fair to Mr Baldwin and to a lesser extent to Mr Chamberlain to say that two former members of the Foreign Service, Sir Walford Selby and Mr Ashton-Gwatkin, have borne witness to the confusion caused in the Foreign Office after 1931 by the intervention of Sir Warren Fisher, exercising his supposed powers as Head of the Civil Service, which divided authority inside the office and interfered with the transmission of information from the envoys abroad to the Cabinet. Mr Baldwin was undoubtedly misled, for instance, about the strength of German armaments.

supply Italy with oil, nothing can stop her except force—which in fact would mean that Britain would have to fight single-handed. We ourselves have occupied enormous tracts of Africa—I am not prepared to fight Italy on this issue. And there is the additional strong reason for abstention, that Germany is the real enemy, and it is most important for us that we should have Italy on our side, or at least neutral, in the event of a war with Germany. Therefore we shall not actively intervene.' 'A statesman,' wrote Lord Rosebery, 'however much he may be animated by the ideal, has to deal with the real, with facts and circumstances as they are'—and that was certainly a sentiment with which Lord Salisbury would have agreed.

But not so the British Governments of the thirties. Mr Baldwin gave effect to the emotional demands of the British people that sanctions should be imposed, but that on no account should the nation become involved in war. This mixture of Quixotism and cowardice ended by driving Mussolini into the arms of Hitler, whose embrace he had hitherto managed to shun. At one moment diplomatic good sense prevailed in Downing Street, and Sir Samuel Hoare (as he then was) came to an agreement with Laval in Paris which would have brought hostilities and sanctions to an end, left the Ethiopian Emperor on his throne with only slightly diminished territory, and, as we now know, Mussolini would have been satisfied. But the British public would have none of it. G.D. as usual interpreted their view, and wrote a brilliant leader entitled 'A Corridor for Camels' making great play with the clause of the Hoare-Laval plan which would have given Haile-Selassie an outlet to the sea; and Baldwin retracted the approval which he had at first given to his Foreign Secretary's Paris Agreement. And so, when the greater war came, the Italian dictator went over to the man he feared most, and the use of the Mediterranean was temporarily lost to us.

Cheered by the failure of the Powers in 1935, Hitler next year invaded the Rhineland; and once more the British Government, public opinion, and 'The Times' invoked the already discredited League, protested only in words, and ended by accepting the *fait accompli*. Observers in Berlin (of whom I was one) were convinced that the critical moment of Hitler's career had come, that it was a reckless scheme ventured by the ruffians who had

hacked Hitler's way to power, and the success of which would assure to them their position as his official advisers. At that time the comparatively respectable von Neurath was still Foreign Minister. He was known to have advised against so flagrant a breach of the freely negotiated Treaty of Locarno. The generals too were against the *coup*, for the prudent reason that they considered German armed strength to be unequal to that of France and Britain combined. Had British public opinion been in a healthy state the flagrant infraction of a treaty in which our country was intimately concerned would alone have made the expulsion of the German troops both a duty and a wise stroke of policy. We know now almost for certain that Hitler would have recalled them, the thugs would have been discredited, and the Führer would have fallen back upon the older and wiser men—and Ribbentrop, who had thrown in his lot with Goering, Goebbels, and Himmler, would not so soon have taken the place of von Neurath.

In vain such warnings as were possible were sent from Berlin. G.D. described (in his journal) the two 'Times' Correspondents in Berlin as 'inclined to be a bit wild,' and he deprecated the 'hubbub' in Europe. He went to the Foreign Office and found 'Anthony Eden determined to bring good out of evil'; and the consequent leading article next morning was entitled 'A Chance to Rebuild.' Later the Foreign Secretary admitted that a broken treaty was not the best foundation on which to base the new order, but it was too late. In my opinion (and I followed it all at very close quarters) March 1936 was the one moment when Hitler might have been stopped. Admitted that a strong policy would have made the public gasp; but the consequence of weakness was that Hitler had learned just how much he could do without rousing effective armed opposition, and proceeded to use his knowledge effectually for the next three years.

But there is not space to discuss the whole pros and cons of the appeasement policy. In public G.D. maintained to the end of his life that he was unrepentant and that to have gone to war over Czechoslovakia would have split the Commonwealth, with whose representatives in London he was always in very close contact. In private I heard him say, 'I was wrong about Hitler.' The two are not entirely incompatible. The opportunity of taking

advantage of Hitler's bluff in 1936 having been missed, warlike action at any time between that date and September 1939 would have divided the country and the Empire. As for having been wrong about Hitler (whom he regarded as a bulwark against Communism), it was difficult for him to go against the advice of men like Lord Lothian, to say nothing of two Prime Ministers. His great friend Philip Lothian used to visit Hitler, and I remember his coming into 'The Times' office direct from Liverpool Street one evening, discoursing at some length on Hitler's having already got what he wanted, and punching the desk at which I was writing, saying, 'I can tell you this, Kennedy, Hitler wants peace.' Lothian was a man in whom was no guile, and who little understood the dissimulation so deeply embedded in the German character.

'No more can you distinguish of a man
Than of his outward show'

may have been true of Lothian—it was certainly not of Geoffrey Dawson, who (though blind to snobbery) missed no other faults or vices. He once came to luncheon in my house to meet Ribbentrop, and protested in plain language to the German Foreign Minister about Hitler's killings. Ribbentrop rose from his chair, walked to the window, and exclaimed, as if to himself, 'We are two hundred years behind you.' (He would have been nearer the mark if he had said five hundred years, carrying us back to the Wars of the Roses.)

'The Times' should, of course, have had a Foreign Editor, and if there was nobody on the staff capable of both writing leaders and taking charge of the Foreign Department, somebody should have been brought in. Wickham Steed was at the time of Harold Williams's death only fifty-seven years old and he had served as Foreign Editor for six years under Dawson.* Steed was obviously brilliantly equipped for the post. Perhaps the difficulty was that he was too brilliant. One might find parallel cases in politics. A few years after this, when Baldwin was reconstructing his Government and the question arose of including Winston Churchill, the Prime

* Dawson paid a tribute to the loyalty with which Steed served him during that period, but he never forgave Northcliffe for having made the appointment behind his (G.D.'s) back.

Minister refused, saying that 'Winston would be a destructive force'—just as Lord Salisbury, half a century before, had felt, if he did not say it, that Lord Randolph Churchill was better outside than inside his Cabinet. Steed would no doubt have appeared a disturbing element to G.D. He would certainly never have acquiesced in a policy of appeasement. Moreover, Steed had not hesitated to step into G.D.'s shoes when the latter quarrelled with Northcliffe. They could hardly have worked harmoniously again in P.H.S. G.D. wanted a team, and he wanted to be sole leader of the team. Still, it was a blunder or a sign of over-confidence, or both, to abolish the post of Foreign Editor altogether.*

To sum up, there can be no doubts about G.D.'s technical greatness as an editor. He possessed all the qualifications of the leader, the administrator, and the writer. He brought more 'scoops' to the paper than the best of his reporters. He had a zest for his work that never failed, however late the night or however much he had had to do during the day. His energy was amazing. In spite of late hours he always liked to have a game of tennis about ten in the morning in summer, or a walk with his dog in the winter. I never saw him lounge or loll about, even off duty. He was always taut, but never over-tense or nervy. I suppose there is no job, except that of an officer in battle, in which decisions have to be taken so instantly as in that of editorship. When the paper is about to go to press and more news comes in, the question whether it is important enough to be included, and if so what must be excluded in order to make room for it, cannot wait—the answer must be forthcoming at once. Of course there is a member of the staff who is specially concerned with late news, but often the decision has to be referred to the editor, and if an alteration in a leading article is involved, the decision is entirely his. Immediate decisions have also to be taken by him when news that seems important arrives from some dubious quarter; and of course the line of policy has sometimes to be indicated on somewhat meagre information. G.D. not only had the knack of swift,

* I once suggested to G.D. that Steed should be offered the post of Paris Correspondent of 'The Times,' which was vacant. 'I don't object to Steed,' was G.D.'s answer; but he gave it in that inflected tone of voice which leaves in the listener's mind an exactly opposite meaning to that of the words.

intuitive decision; he also knew when to decide that he could not decide, and that the matter could be held over. But the life of a newspaper is twenty-four hours, and if 'The Times' expresses no opinion when important news is published, people are apt to exclaim, 'How feeble!' An editor's normal prevision is twenty-four hours, and this expected immediacy of comment is a double handicap. In the first place the comment may be hasty, and secondly it militates against long views. His immediate job is to produce 'a good paper.' 'It's no use looking too far ahead,' G.D. once wrote to his father in his younger days, and I think this may have been one of his weak points. We often find a man's weakness in the exaggeration of his virtues. G.D. had a remarkable gift for becoming totally absorbed in whatever he was doing at the moment, even when it was quite unimportant; he found little time to 'sit and think.' And again, his capacity to remain unruffled in an emergency (when things were boiling in the office he became quite preternaturally calm) led to his treating as exaggerated the excitement caused by an international crisis, and he hardly would listen to a man who spoke with strong feeling. He himself had an amazing capacity for reticence. And he could convey his meaning with an absolute minimum of words—even without words. If somebody incautiously entered his room when he was writing a leader a ferocious glare would send him hurrying out. He liked leader-writers whose minds were on the same wavelength as his own. A few words on either side were enough to produce a full column. But he was not incapable of playing off one man against another, and he could bowl somebody over at third or fourth remove. He had in fact learned a trick or two from his close association with Northcliffe.

And he certainly had his predilections and antipathies, as most of us have. It was unfortunate that Sir Winston Churchill's path had crossed his on many occasions—in Africa, in India, during the General Strike of 1926 and the Abdication crisis, and on most points of policy during the between-the-wars period. He disliked his 'warlike temperament.' But at least when war did come he gave him all the support and praise which 'The Times' could provide.

His friends were of a rather different calibre, and he

had many in high places and in humble, for he was adaptable and many-sided and his interests were as numerous as they were varied. He was a farmer in Yorkshire who did the round of his crops and his domestic animals with a connoisseur's eye. He was a devoted alumnus of Eton and Magdalen, and a Fellow of All Souls who loved to use his rooms there (which he shared with the Archbishop of Canterbury), and to spend the evening discussing learnedly the big issue of the day with his brother Fellows. He had shrewd friends on the Stock Exchange and knew how valuable their advice could be. And the simplest pleasures were his. He was a tremendous walker—though perhaps in this case the pleasure was enhanced when he was also carrying a gun. Every year he managed to get in some grouse shooting over his own moor near Langcliffe (his house in Yorkshire) and pheasant shooting at Chevening, Lord Stanhope's home. He had two cars at his disposal and went out of London for most week-ends, often to Cliveden, Blickling, and other big houses, in each of which he enjoyed 'the cream of life,' as Lord Houghton called the intimate conversation of important men. Mr Baldwin, when Prime Minister, once stayed with him at Langcliffe. He was on Christian-term names with at least two Prime Ministers, and with more persons probably, in all walks of life, than anyone else of his generation. Friendship meant much to him, and he never let a friend down. That, indeed, is happily not a rare quality, but the editor of a newspaper is put more often than most people into the ambiguous position of having close and confidential relations with somebody who may not be congenial to him. In such cases the other person, whoever he might be, knew that he could entirely rely on the absolute loyalty of G.D. He was not himself a spontaneous conversationalist, but he was the perfect listener, and he threw into the common talk pithy, shrewd, helpful, bantering, or cynical observations of his own. He would also be unexpectedly flippant—flippancy being his safety-valve, as a colleague has written of him.

I believe that most people, like myself, must feel that life has been richer for having known G.D. well. The last time I saw him was shortly before his death, when he was walking sturdily, but as in a dream, along Pall Mall, past the Travellers' and the Carlton, where he had for forty

years been *persona grata*—but so like a somnambulist in the manner of his gait, looking neither to the right nor to the left, so lacking in his normal alertness, that I dared not interrupt his march. He seemed to be lost in his own thoughts, or in a dream—did the dream run in his head like a refrain from Dryden :

‘ Not heaven itself over the past hath power ;
But what has been has been, and I have had my hour.’

A. L. KENNEDY.

Art. 3.—THE JEWS IN BRITAIN.

THE COMPLETION of three hundred years since the readmission of Jews to Britain, which is being celebrated by the Jewish community this year, is a notable landmark in their history, from which it is natural to attempt a retrospect and to present a survey of the principal phases and facets of their variegated progress. Their readmission had been preceded by an absence of more than three centuries and a half, which was due to their expulsion by Edward I in 1290. This calamity, which reflected the religious intolerance of the age and had its counterpart in other countries of Europe, formed the climax to a succession of acts of oppression extending over two hundred years. Excluded by the feudal system from any part in the social structure of the English people, the Jews, who were taken under the 'protection' of the King, nevertheless discharged a valuable function in the national economy (in which money-lending was forbidden to Christians by the Canon Law), for they helped repeatedly to replenish the State exchequer, and they financed not only Strongbow's expedition to Ireland but also the erection of castles, abbeys, and cathedrals that exist to the present day. Yet, so far from receiving any recognition for these services, they had to suffer various forms of degradation and persecution, their homes were exposed to pillage and destruction, and thousands were massacred in different parts of the country, so that they must have accepted the edict of expulsion with a certain relief.

The memory of those tragic experiences proved a prolonged deterrent to any temptation to return, and it was not until it had become effaced by the passage of time and there was a far more formidable catastrophe in the banishment from Spain in 1492, followed by that from Portugal, that some Jews ventured to seek refuge in England again. Before the middle of the sixteenth century there was already a small community of crypto-Jews (called *Marraños*), who had fled from the Iberian peninsula, living in London and Bristol, and who, while assuming the guise of Protestant refugees, met for religious worship in secret; but most of them left the country when the burning of Protestants became common in the reign of Queen Mary. The accession of Elizabeth, however, was followed by the

revival of the Marrano community, whose most notable member was Dr Roderigo Lopez, a native of Portugal. Lopez, who settled in London in 1559, was appointed the first house physician at St Bartholomew's Hospital and later became physician to the Queen ; but unfortunately he used his influential position to engage in political intrigue, with the result that he was falsely accused by his opponents of plotting to poison the Queen, whereupon he was tried and executed in 1594. The effect was to arouse a feeling of hostility against Jews in general, which found partial reflection in Shakespeare's Shylock, and the Marrano community gradually declined and disappeared.

Not until after another fifty years did sufficient sympathy for the Jews become manifest in England to render possible a concerted effort for their readmission, although even before any official steps were taken for this purpose a small number of them were again living in London by the time of the Protectorate. The movement for their legal resettlement was the product of a combination of factors, Jewish and non-Jewish. The apostles of Puritanism were favourably disposed to the Jews as the people of the Old Testament ; the study of Hebrew was being fostered at the universities ; there was a steady growth of religious toleration ; and even treatises were written advocating that Jews be allowed freedom of worship and pleading for their restoration to the Holy Land. There was thus by the middle of the seventeenth century a philo-Semitic atmosphere, of which advantage could be taken by a Jew of vision and enterprise. Such a man was the Rabbi in Amsterdam, Menasseh ben Israel, a scholar and polyglot author, who was held in high esteem by the leading savants of many lands. A son of crypto-Jewish parents, who, like so many other Jews from the Iberian peninsula, had found asylum in Holland, his interests were by no means confined to theology. He brooded over the tribulations of his people, who had been exposed to periodic calamities, of which the latest was the massacre in 1648 in Poland by the revolting Cossacks, and he longed for the Messianic deliverance for which all Jews had prayed for centuries. Pondering on the traditional belief that before this redemption could come the Jewish dispersion must be completed, and having heard that there were already Jews in parts of America, he thought all that was needed to complete the

dispersion and herald the dawn of salvation was that they should be allowed to resettle in England. He therefore expounded his ideas in 1650 in a Latin treatise, '*Spes Israelis*' ('The Hope of Israel'), which was translated into English and dedicated to Parliament. This publication created a sensation in England: it aroused a wave of sympathy and gave birth to a spate of pamphlets.

Before long Menasseh ben Israel was approached by an English sympathiser, John Thurloe, the secretary of a mission headed by Chief Justice Oliver St John, who arrived at The Hague in 1651 to negotiate an alliance between England and the United Provinces. The outcome of the talk was that the Rabbi addressed a formal request to the English Government, which was referred by the Council of State to a committee, of which Oliver Cromwell was a member. The Lord Protector was favourably disposed, not because of any religious reasons or millenarian motives, but primarily on account of utilitarian and particularly commercial considerations. He was aware of the active part that Jews played in international trade, and wished to secure their co-operation and enterprise for the advancement and enrichment of English commerce. The request of the Rabbi was of too momentous a nature to be dealt with by correspondence or through intermediaries. It was necessary that he should come to London himself to plead his case, but owing to a succession of hindrances he did not arrive until September 1655. He brought with him an English pamphlet addressed to the Lord Protector, to whom he also submitted a personal petition praying for permission for the Jews to enjoy freedom of religious worship and the rights of trade, as well as for the repeal of all laws affecting them.

After a preliminary examination by a committee of the Council it was decided that the petition should be considered by a special conference of leading lawyers, ecclesiastics, and merchants. The Whitehall Conference, as it was called, met on Dec. 4, 1655, and was presided over by the Lord Protector himself. He formulated for its discussion two questions: 'Whether it be lawful to receive the Jews? If it be lawful, then upon what terms is it meet to receive them?' On the first question the two judges present decided that it was lawful, as 'there was no law which forbade the Jews' return into England.' The

second question, however, gave rise to a prolonged and occasionally heated debate that occupied a few sessions ; and when Cromwell saw that proposals were being made by some members that would have limited the liberty and usefulness of the Jews, whom he was anxious to welcome, he brought the Conference to an abrupt end on Dec. 18. Menasseh ben Israel then waited patiently for an official declaration of the terms on which Jews could resettle, but Cromwell, in order to avoid any protests that such a statement might have provoked, preferred to make none. He merely allowed it to be understood that Jews were free to come and live in the country, and to practise their religion and engage in trade, so long as they did not make themselves obtrusive. Menasseh was disappointed with the outcome of his mission, but was somewhat consoled when, upon the outbreak of war in 1656 between Spain and England, the Council of State decided that the property of Jews who were Spanish nationals should be immune from confiscation and implicitly allowed them rights of domicile and trade. Further developments of a reassuring nature followed. Cromwell directed the authorities of the City of London to put no obstacle in the way of the Jewish merchants ; a Jew was admitted as a broker ; and land was leased for a Jewish cemetery. After a stay of two years, during which Menasseh wrote a vigorous defence of his people, ' *Vindiciæ Judæorum*, ' he returned to Holland and died two months later.

By the time of the Restoration the Jewish community had been fully established. It consisted initially of Sephardim (*Sepharad* being the Hebrew for Spain), whose first synagogue was in Creechurch Lane from 1657 to 1701, when there was erected a larger house of worship in Bevis Marks, the oldest synagogue extant on English soil (and officially designated a historic monument). Before long they were followed by Jews originating from various parts of Central Europe, who were called Ashkenazim (*Ashkenaz* being the Hebrew for Germany), and who worshipped according to their different ritual in their own synagogue. They were at first apprehensive lest the tolerant policy of Cromwell might be reversed by Charles, but the King and his advisers had met with Jews in their exile and found them helpful, and when an attempt was made to interfere with them he promptly declared that they were under his protection,

Indeed, he went a step further than the Lord Protector, for when some agitators in 1664 threatened to inform against the Jews that they were infringing the Conventicle Act, which prohibited assemblies for prayer except according to the liturgy of the Church of England (and which was aimed only against Christian nonconformists), a petition addressed to the King and referred to the Privy Council elicited a written assurance that the Jews would continue to enjoy the same favour as hitherto. It was the first written confirmation of their rights of domicile and religious liberty, and those rights were never again challenged.

The accession of William and Mary gave a strong impetus to the immigration of Jews from Holland. Many of these were men of considerable wealth, and thanks to their instrumentality London became the bullion market of the world. The City Corporation, however, was jealous of its privileges; it excluded Jews from the freedom of the city and limited them to wholesale trade; but gradually they found their way into the Exchange, where their membership, in 1697, was fixed at twelve. As the eighteenth century advanced the number of Jews who had attained prosperity increased, and their wealth and financial acumen proved of great benefit to the State. The most notable instance in the earlier half of the century was Sampson Gideon (1699-1762), who belonged to one of the Sephardi families that had settled in the British West Indies before they were able to live openly in England. He was the leading financier of the day, the adviser of successive Prime Ministers, and a friend of Sir Robert Walpole. When the Government found itself in 1745 in a very critical situation he rendered substantial help by taking a prominent part in raising for it a loan of 1,700,000*l.*—quite a stupendous sum in those days. And it was thanks to him and other public-spirited Jewish (as well as non-Jewish) merchants that a run on the Bank of England was halted by their openly depositing their funds in it, a service that was acknowledged when the crisis was over by one of their number being chosen as member of the deputation that offered the congratulations of the City to the King.

The desire of the Jews to be free from any restrictions in the lawful exercise of their abilities and to participate more fully in the life of the country naturally made them anxious to obtain the unqualified rights of citizenship, and

after the naturalisation of their fellow Jews in the American Colonies had been rendered possible in 1740 by the English Parliament they expected that a similar measure could be adopted in England. An interval of thirteen years elapsed before a Bill for this purpose was passed in the House of Lords, and as it was likewise accepted in the House of Commons, though against some strong opposition, it was believed that the Act would enter into force. But although its object was only to enable individual foreign Jews to apply for naturalisation, there was such a public outcry against the Act that the Government felt obliged to repeal it. The leaders of the Jewish community now realised that it was necessary to have a representative body to exercise permanent watch over their interests, and accordingly the 'London Committee of Deputies of British Jews' was established for this purpose in 1760. It consisted at first only of Sephardim, the more influential section of the community, but after a time representatives of the Ashkenazi synagogues were also admitted to membership, and ultimately the latter became the majority. This 'London Committee,' now commonly known as the Jewish Board of Deputies, grew in importance as the community expanded, and widened its membership to include representatives of provincial congregations, which began to spring up from the middle of the eighteenth century. The esteem that it enjoyed from the following century among Jewish communities less fortunately circumstanced in other lands was due in great measure to the prestige of its most famous President, Sir Moses Montefiore (1784-1885), a brave and generous humanitarian, who undertook many long and hazardous journeys for the relief of his fellow Jews oppressed in Russia and various parts of the Orient.

During the long period in which they were denied any participation in political life the Jews concentrated upon the gradual establishment of their own institutions, particularly for educational and charitable purposes. They regarded it as a communal duty (as, indeed, Jews in all lands and at all times have done) to look after their own sick, poor, and orphans, and there was never any difficulty in collecting voluntary funds for all branches of philanthropy. But the harmony that prevailed in the sphere of benevolence failed to extend to religious observance. The

strict discipline exercised by the synagogue authorities, combined with the personal ambition of some of the richer element who enjoyed social intercourse with their Christian neighbours, resulted in cases of secession and inter-marriage, occasionally even with members of the English aristocracy. The removal of many wealthy Jews from the confines of the City to the western district of London, which made it impossible to attend synagogue on the Sabbath without breaking the law that forbade riding on the day of rest, coupled with the desire to introduce reforms in the liturgy and to reduce the two days of a festival to one, prompted a number of them to agitate for a new synagogue more conveniently situated, with a revised ritual and an organ. They were encouraged in their endeavours by the reforms that had already been adopted by some congregations in Germany, and, although they were met with the most vehement opposition from both Rabbinical and lay leaders, twenty-four families seceded in 1840 and established a Reform Synagogue in West London. The membership of this new congregation gradually increased, and the Reform movement spread to Manchester and Bradford (where there were many Jews of German origin), but it took some decades before there was a personal or social reconciliation between the dissidents and the orthodox community, which was organised in 1870 as the United Synagogue. In the following year was founded the Anglo-Jewish Association in the interests of Jews in Eastern lands; its primary purpose was to maintain schools, and for many years it co-operated with the Board of Deputies in foreign affairs.

The struggle for civil and political emancipation was long and stubborn. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Jews could be debarred from voting at Parliamentary elections; they could be excluded from the Bar if the Inns of Court objected; they were forbidden to trade within the City of London; and they were shut out from Parliament, from high commissions in the Army and the Navy, from degrees and scholarships at the University of Cambridge, and even from attendance at the University of Oxford. The battle for the removal of these disabilities began immediately after the emancipation of the Catholics in 1829, and was vigorously continued for forty years until the Jew was placed on the same level as his Christian fellow citizen. In 1831 the Corporation of London opened

its boundaries to Jewish traders ; in 1833 the first Jew, Francis Goldsmid, was called to the Bar ; and two years later an Act was passed that relieved all voters of the necessity of taking the Oath of Abjuration and thus permitted Jewish electors to exercise the franchise. The efforts of the Jews were directed simultaneously to obtaining the right to hold municipal office and the right to sit in Parliament. They succeeded much earlier in regard to the former right by first securing the election of one of their community to office and then procuring the sanction of Parliament for an accomplished fact. Thus, in 1835, David Salomons was elected and allowed to act as Sheriff of London ; ten years later, after he had been repeatedly elected alderman, he was permitted to hold this office too ; and another ten years later, in 1855, this untiring champion of Jewish rights was acclaimed Lord Mayor of London. During the hundred years that have elapsed since then other Jews have also attained this dignity, some have presided over the London County Council, and several have served as lord mayors or mayors of provincial cities.

The acquisition of the right to sit in Parliament proved a much more protracted process. The first Bill for this purpose was rejected by the Commons in 1830, but the second Bill, passed by the Commons in 1833, was rejected by the House of Lords. From the latter year Bill after Bill was passed by the Commons, only to be rejected by the Lords for over twenty years. The Jews had one of their most eloquent supporters in the House of Commons in Benjamin Disraeli, who had experienced no religious difficulty himself in entering it, as he had been baptised in boyhood. In 1847 the same tactics were adopted as in the campaign for securing municipal office, but although Baron Lionel de Rothschild (1806-1879) was elected member for the City of London in that year and again in 1850, and although David Salomons was elected for Greenwich in 1851 and actually spoke in the House (at the cost of a fine), it was not until July 26, 1858, that the former was able, as the first Jew, to take his seat in the House of Commons by virtue of a resolution to permit Jewish members to omit from the oath the words 'on the true faith of a Christian.' In 1870 the University Tests Act enabled Jews to graduate and hold scholarships at the ancient universities ; and in 1885 Sir Nathaniel Rothschild, a son of Baron Lionel, was

made a peer and, as Lord Rothschild, was the first Jew to sit in the House of Lords.

From the time of their emancipation the Jews have taken an active and increasing part in political and municipal life. At first there was a traditional attachment to the Liberal party as the main instrument of their enfranchisement, but later they were almost equally divided between Liberals and Conservatives, and (while there is no 'Jewish vote') since the decline of the Liberal and the advance of the Labour Party they are found in the latter in much larger number (especially in the Commons). During the past fifty years they have provided Great Britain with a number of able statesmen, notably Viscount Samuel, who has held various Cabinet offices besides that of Home Secretary, was the first High Commissioner in Palestine and leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords for ten years; Edwin Montagu, Secretary for India, whose progressive reforms profoundly influenced British-Indian relations; Lord Hore-Belisha and Emanuel Shinwell, Secretaries for War; the (second) Marquis of Reading, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs; and Lord Nathan, Under-Secretary for War and Minister of Civil Aviation.

The highest distinctions attained by an English Jew were those of the first Marquis of Reading, who filled with dignity and success the exacting offices of Lord Chief Justice, Ambassador to the United States, and Viceroy and Governor-General of India. Sir George Jessel was Master of the Rolls in 1873, and among his distinguished successors in the judiciary are Lord Justice Cohen and Justice Karminski. Jewry has likewise provided the British Dominions with statesmen and judges of the highest rank. The first native-born Governor-General of Australia was Sir Isaac Isaacs, who had previously been Chief Justice. South Australia had a Jewish Premier in V. L. Solomon, and New Zealand in Sir Julius Vogel, while the latter Dominion also had a Chief Justice in Sir Michael Myers. Moreover, the roll of British Colonial Governors includes Sir Andrew Cohen (Uganda) and the late Sir Matthew Nathan (Gold Coast, Hongkong, Natal, and Queensland).

Not only in the field of legislation and administration have Jews played a worthy part, but also in defence of the country. Since the fight at Trafalgar, and indeed from an earlier date, they have fought in all the battles, on land and

sea, in which Britain has been engaged. Sir Alexander Schomberg was in command of the vessel that covered Wolfe's landing at Quebec, Joseph Montefiore was present at the taking of Martinique and Guadeloupe, and the Duke of Wellington had fifteen Jewish officers under him at Waterloo. In the First World War there were 50,000 Jewish combatants, of whom 9,000 were killed ; five were awarded the Victoria Cross and fifty the D.S.O. ; while among those who held important positions the most distinguished was General Sir John Monash, who was in supreme command of the Australian troops on the Western Front. For the first time for hundreds of years Jews fought as Jews in formations of their own—first, in the Zion Mule Corps at Gallipoli, and afterwards as battalions of the Royal Fusiliers in Palestine, where their prowess was commended in General Allenby's despatch. In the Second World War the number of Jews (men and women) of the United Kingdom was 60,000, forming over 15 per cent. of the Jewish population, a higher proportion than among the general population. They provided four brigadiers ; their awards included a Victoria Cross and numerous other distinctions ; and their losses amounted to 1,150 killed or died on active service.

Their record in the arts of peace is no less impressive. They began to make contributions to England's intellectual life from the first half of the eighteenth century, when Moses Mendes, poet and dramatist, wrote plays and operas for Drury Lane and Covent Garden, and the number of works that they have added to English literature and learning is truly imposing. At the end of that century Isaac D'Israeli had a reputation as novelist and literary historian, but he was outshone by his famous son Benjamin, while the Jewish origin of some authors has been obscured by their change of name as well as of faith. Thus, Sir Francis Palgrave, one of the first scientific historians in England, began life as Francis Cohen, and but for his conversion to Christianity his son, who became Professor of Poetry at Oxford and famous as the compiler of 'The Golden Treasury,' might also have been known as Cohen. Among poets whose sterling merits have been acknowledged by most discerning critics are Isaac Rosenberg (who died in action in the First World War), Humbert Wolfe, Arthur Waley, C.H., and Siegfried Sassoon, while of the great host

of novelists of the past century it must suffice to mention Israel Zangwill, Leonard Merrick, G. B. Stern, and S. L. Bensusan. Philip Guedella wrote history with a brilliant pen, Harold Laski's works on political science are studied on both sides of the Atlantic, and Samuel Alexander's eminence as a philosopher won him the Order of Merit. It was particularly in the field of Shakespearian research that two Jewish scholars were distinguished, Sir Sidney Lee and Sir Israel Gollancz, of whom the former also made an invaluable contribution to English cultural records by his editing the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' and the latter by organising the establishment of the British Academy, of which he was the first Secretary.

In the world of drama the two best-known Jewish names are Arthur Pinero and Alfred Sutro, while in music Sir Frederic Cowen ranks high as a composer, and Dame Myra Hess, Harriet Cohen, and Benno Moiseiwitsch are famous instrumentalists. In art the foremost Jewish representatives are Sir William Rothenstein, Sir Jacob Epstein, Mark Gertler, Alfred Wolmark, and two former members of the Royal Academy, Solomon Hart and Solomon J. Solomon.

The record of Jewish achievement in the advance of medical science has been maintained by Dr Ernst Boris Chain, a refugee from Nazi Germany, who shared with Sir Alexander Fleming in the discovery of penicillin and also shared with him the Nobel Prize. Another refugee from Germany, Dr L. Gutmann, discovered an efficacious means of treating paraplegia (paralysis of the lower extremities). A distinguished doctor of a former generation was the throat specialist, Sir Felix Semon, who was Physician to Edward VII, and the outstanding Jewish physician of the present is Professor Sir Henry Cohen, President of the British Medical Association. Among Jewish scientists two famous names in the past were James Sylvester, a leader in pure mathematics in the nineteenth century, and Raphael Meldola, one of the greatest authorities on photo-chemistry and a distinguished biologist. The position occupied by Jews among scientists in England at the present day is sufficiently attested by the fact that twenty-two are Fellows of the Royal Society. Among the Fellows of the parallel body, the British Academy, there are eight Jews, while the number who have held or hold positions as

professors or lecturers at the universities, ancient and modern, would form quite a lengthy list.

In the realm of finance and in various spheres of economic activity Jews have rendered notable services to the State and to the country in general. The Rothschilds, under the leadership of Baron Lionel, financed the Irish Famine Loan of 8,000,000*l.*, raised 16,000,000*l.* for the English Government to meet the costs of the Crimean War, and advanced 4,000,000*l.* for England's purchase of the Suez Canal shares. In the industrial world a premier place was occupied by the first Lord Melchett (son of Ludwig Mond, a brilliant chemist and a German immigrant), who was the founder of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, the largest industrial combine in the British Empire. The proportion of Jews engaged in commerce and transport and in manufacturing and mechanical industries far exceeds that in the liberal professions and public service. The immigrants from Eastern Europe who settled in England in large numbers from the eighties of last century until the Aliens Act came into force at the beginning of 1906 brought with them the industries in which they were employed in their native lands, particularly the making of clothing, boots, furniture, cigarettes, and furs, though they and their fellow Jews are also represented in almost all other trades. They have made London, Manchester, and Leeds the centres of the tailoring trade, while the waterproof-garment industry in Manchester is also in Jewish hands. The arrival of thousands of refugees from Nazi-tyrannised countries from 1933 conferred further economic benefits upon this country, for they brought with them not only their labour and skill but also, in many cases, considerable capital, knowledge of patent processes, and extensive information about the export trade.

Despite their gradual increase during the past three centuries the Jews in Britain number only about 450,000, of whom more than half are in Greater London, less than one-seventh in the three cities of Manchester, Leeds, and Glasgow, and the rest scattered in over a hundred cities, from Plymouth to Aberdeen and from Brighton to Belfast. They form the best-organised Jewish community in Europe, with an elaborate multiplicity of institutions devoted to all kinds of religious, educational, cultural, social and charitable purposes. They have their own Rabbinical court (*Beth*

Din) for the settlement of civil as well as religious problems, and countless societies and clubs for lovers of music, drama, art, and sport. In the early part of this century further religious differences found expression in the establishment by Claude Montefiore, a theological scholar and philanthropist, of the Liberal Synagogue, which marked a more drastic departure than the Reform Synagogue from the traditional ritual, and, as though to counterbalance this, there was established an organisation to promote a greater degree of orthodoxy than that represented by the United Synagogue. But whatever differences may divide them on questions of conformity with tradition, the Jews are united in the field of charity and, whenever the need arises, in defence of the honour of their people.

Philanthropy has always been a cardinal element in Jewish life, and it has been displayed in this country without regard to community or creed. Hospitals and orphanages, universities and libraries, in both London and the provinces, have for over a century received munificent benefactions or endowments from Jewish philanthropists, whose names have been perpetuated by the institutions that owe to them their existence. Nor, if charity begins at home, does it, in the case of English Jewry, stay there, for no appeal from Jews in lands of distress or oppression—and there have been numberless such occasions since the first pogroms in Russia over seventy years ago—has remained unanswered. Response to these appeals is but a natural manifestation of the feeling of solidarity that binds together the widely dispersed communities of Jewry throughout the world, and which testifies to the permanent vitality of their historic consciousness in this age of increasing assimilation.

The most impressive form of this solidarity has been shown in the moral and material support accorded by the Jews of Britain to the realisation of the age-old yearning for the restoration of their people as a nation in their ancestral land. Sympathy with this idea has formed part of the British tradition since the days of Cromwell; it was reflected in the instruction given by Palmerston to the British Consul in Jerusalem to take the Jews in the Holy Land under his protection; it found expression in the offer by the British Government to the Zionist Organisation at the beginning of this century of a territory in East Africa for an autonomous settlement; and it reached its pregnant

consummation in the Balfour Declaration of nearly forty years ago. The administration of the Mandate for Palestine by Britain imposed upon the Jews in this country additional responsibilities, which they readily and adequately discharged, and the creation of the State of Israel has increased those responsibilities, which they fulfil, through the agency of a widely ramified and generously supported organisation, without in any way abating their loyalty. Their relations with their non-Jewish fellow citizens are fostered in a spirit of mutual friendship by the Council of Christians and Jews, under the joint leadership of the ecclesiastical heads of the two communities, and that friendship is also shown in sympathy for the cause of Israel.

Such, then, in broad outline is the position of the Jews in Britain three hundred years after their readmission. In any attempt at its appraisal it must be borne in mind that they form less than 1 per cent. of the total population, and judged in relation to their number they may be said to have made no unworthy contribution to the national life of the country. But whatever they may have achieved has been merely the fruit of their abilities and the natural product of a sense of duty, and they expect no praise for what they are or for what they have done. Content with the blessings of justice and liberty under which they live, they will continue along the path marked out for them by the generations that have gone.

ISRAEL COHEN.

Art. 4.—CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT.

THE CIVIL SERVICE, accused in pre-war days of taking more than its fair share of the better brains and thus starving commerce and industry, now finds itself perplexed in the recruitment of staff in various grades. The report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, 1953-55, published in November 1955 (Cmd 9613) and irreverently known as the 'Teadrinkers' Manual,' draws attention to this situation. No longer can the Government rely on attracting very large numbers of excellent candidates for competitive examination, and some posts are being filled, either on the recommendation of headmasters or otherwise, without the requirement of an educational competitive test. 'Open competition,' the head of the Treasury declared some forty years ago, '... seems to me practically the only thing which is safe and is not open to the grossest abuses,' and that view has been repeated so often by official spokesmen that it has become almost an article of faith.

Open competition as the normal method of recruitment to the Civil Service was accepted only after a fierce struggle lasting over several generations. A century ago, Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir Charles Trevelyan, in their famous report on the 'Organisation of the Permanent Civil Service,' submitted four main proposals for the reform of the Civil Service, at that time grossly inefficient and tinged with corruption: (1) recruitment by open competition; (2) division of official work into higher and lower, with classes recruited separately for each; (3) unification of the service; and (4) the establishment of a central body to conduct examinations in place of the existing system of leaving each department to apply such tests as it chose.

The proposal for open competition was at once denounced as striking at long-established privilege and likely to lead to deterioration of standards. There had been a possibility in 1849 that Lord John Russell would surrender the right of nomination, to which Prime Ministers had always attached great importance. A letter to him from Trevelyan in that year refers to a suggestion by Russell to set up a committee to examine the arrangements for recruitment to the public service, a step which would, Trevelyan noted enthusiastically, 'furnish such a decisive

proof of your readiness to allow the exercise of your patronage to be subject to any regulations which the public interest requires, as must have an important moral and political effect, beside attaining the immediate object of securing for the future a superior class of public servants.' The idea, however, fell by the wayside.

When Lord Aberdeen succeeded Russell, he showed some sympathy towards the reforms suggested by Northcote and Trevelyan, and the Queen's Speech on the opening of Parliament in 1854 referred to changes in the procedure. 'The establishment required for the conduct of the Civil Service and the arrangements bearing upon its condition,' she said, 'have recently been under review; and I will direct a plan to be laid before you which will have for its object to improve the system of admission and thereby to increase the efficiency of the service.' But Aberdeen's administration fell shortly afterwards, and Palmerston's Government had little sympathy with the proposed reforms.

Not only did Palmerston share the view that a Prime Minister would be seriously handicapped in manipulating Parliament unless the Patronage Secretary had at his disposal large numbers of public appointments, but he favoured the nomination system as a protection against the employment of men who might be socially unacceptable. If posts were open to all, the argument ran, the Civil Service might obtain more able men, but brilliancy would not compensate politicians for the trials of having to share the conduct of official business with 'the lower classes.' Northcote and Trevelyan had urged that, instead of the system of recruiting most of the staff in the same grade of clerk, departments should recruit a special class to shoulder the more responsible tasks, but departmental chiefs in the middle of the nineteenth century saw no need for so revolutionary a step. Ministers could personally handle all the important papers and much of the middle-grade work within their offices, and most of them looked for little support from the majority of their officials and thought it nonsense to tamper with the establishment.

While large numbers of people agreed that the introduction of common standards and an overall control might produce good results, such reforms could be achieved only at the cost of interfering with the authority of departmental

Ministers. Palmerston would have strongly resisted the intervention of others when he held appointments in his earlier years in the Admiralty and War Office, and he did not mean to ask members of his administration to submit to direction on how to do their jobs.

The public, however, looked for some improvement in the machinery of Government, since the inadequacies of the supply arrangements in the Crimean War had become widely publicised, and a gesture was needed to quell the clamour. The least objectionable of the main proposals made by Northcote and Trevelyan was the setting up of an independent body to recruit candidates, and Palmerston agreed to the establishment of the Civil Service Commission. Its powers were severely limited. The Commission had the right to conduct examinations, but these examinations were to be open only to candidates who could find a patron to grant them a nomination. The Order in Council of May 21, 1855, which established the Commission also left a loophole whereby heads of departments could in certain circumstances continue to select their own staff without the formality of any educational test.

Shortly after the Civil Service Commission was formed, it reported that more than half the candidates had failed to qualify in examinations, and interested parties raised a shout that too much knowledge was required from young aspirants and that the tests were unfair. A Parliamentary Committee considered some of the complaints in 1860 and, inevitably, heard that 'candidates whose intellect and education are more than sufficient to qualify them for passing the required test are disabled by anxiety and apprehension from doing themselves justice before the examiners.' The Committee agreed that the Commissioners had made errors, but concluded that such errors were not 'more frequent or grave than are inseparable from the transaction of all human affairs.' Ten more years elapsed before Gladstone's Government accepted open competition as the normal method of recruitment, but a number of exceptions still survived for half a century.

All the reforms proposed by Northcote and Trevelyan were accepted in course of time, and, though naturally changes have been made, the Service is still largely based on their recommendations. In 1920 the Government accepted alterations in the division of work which were

proposed by a committee of officials, and a Royal Commission under the chairmanship of Lord Tomlin suggested minor modifications in 1931. Although other enquiries have taken place since that time, no overall survey of the Service had been made for more than twenty years until the Royal Commission of 1953-55.

Nearly 640,000 men and women are now employed in the non-industrial Civil Service at a cost of around 400,000,000*l.* per annum in salaries. Some 200,000 are in the minor grades of the Post Office, and typists, messengers, and porters account for 56,000. The remainder comprises what most people mean when they talk of Civil Servants. The professional, technical, and scientific classes number 72,000, and the general service classes, together slightly in excess of a quarter of a million, are divided into four—the Clerical Assistant Class, for more or less mechanical operations; the Clerical Class, for simple clerical duties; the Executive Class, for carrying out well-defined policies and accounting work; and the Administrative Class, for policy and direction. The report of the recent Royal Commission gives the following figures for the general services classes at July 1, 1955:

Administrative	2,761
Executive, etc.	66,504
Clerical, clerical assistants, etc.	184,776

These figures relate to the Home Civil Service; about 6,000 men and women are engaged in the Foreign Service.

In 1938 over 13,000 applicants competed for posts in the clerical class, which draws largely from school-leavers between the ages of 16 and 18. Over 4,000 candidates were declared successful, with a surplus of acceptable candidates exceeding 5,000. By 1950 the number of applicants had fallen to about half, and the Civil Service Commissioners could find no surplus acceptable candidates; in 1954, when the number of posts to be filled exceeded 4,300, only about 2,500 of acceptable standard could be recruited by examination. As an experiment, the Civil Service Commissioners have begun to offer posts in the clerical classes to boys and girls who hold the general certificate of education, dispensing with the requirement of further examination. The salary of the class starts at about 200*l.* per annum (at age 16) and proceeds by yearly

CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT

187

increments to a maximum of around 600*l.*, plus regular overtime. The Royal Commission 1953–55 has recommended a starting salary of 225*l.* with a maximum of 650*l.*, but with longer basic working hours and without therefore the same opportunity for regular overtime.

Grades proliferate in the Civil Service, and the executive class is divided into six—junior, higher, senior, chief, senior chief, and principal executive officer, with a few more senior posts. Recruitment is to the basic grade of junior executive, and such posts are filled principally by examination restricted to serving clerical staff, by promotion without examination from the clerical grades, and by open competition from school-leavers between the ages of 17½ and 19. In 1938, 2,389 competed in the open competition for school-leavers, of whom 336 were appointed and the surplus acceptable candidates numbered 447. In 1954, 2,095 competed, of whom 336 were appointed, and the number of surplus acceptable candidates had dropped to 30.

The junior executive scale is at present 320*l.* at 18 by yearly increments to a maximum of 870*l.*, and payments for extra hours, etc., bring the maximum of 940*l.* The Royal Commission proposes 350*l.* to 925*l.*, with the abolition of regular overtime. The other grades of the class are filled by promotion and are at present paid on salary scales which range up to over 2,000*l.* The Royal Commission suggests little alteration in the scales, except in the top posts.

The scales mentioned above apply to male clerical and executive grades employed in London. In the principal provincial towns salaries are slightly abated and are reduced still further in the smaller centres of population, where rents and the cost of living are lower. Equal pay for women in the Civil Service is now being implemented, though not so quickly as the staff associations think reasonable.

The administrative class is almost entirely stationed in the London area. It consists of six grades—assistant principal, principal, assistant secretary, under secretary, deputy secretary, and permanent secretary. The basic grade of assistant principal is the normal method of entry for University graduates. About 50 posts are thrown open to competition each year in the Home Civil Service and the Foreign Service has 20–30 vacancies.

In 1938, 389 candidates entered the examination for the administrative class of the Home Civil Service, of whom 75 were declared successful; but in 1955, only 31 of the candidates were able to satisfy the examiners on their suitability for appointment.

The salary of an assistant principal is at present about 500*l.* per annum rising to over 900*l.*, and the principal grade, to which assistant principals are normally promoted within seven years, goes to a maximum of 1,600*l.*, with additional payment for extra hours; the higher grades carry salaries reaching 2,200*l.*, 2,600*l.*, and 3,250*l.*, with permanent secretaries, who are in charge of major departments, receiving a fixed salary of 4,500*l.* All the grades of the administrative class are recommended by the Royal Commission for considerable increases—an additional 1,500*l.* per annum for permanent secretaries, 1,000*l.* for deputy secretaries, and 650*l.* for under secretaries. An improvement in the salaries of the top class was to be expected, for while the clerical and executive grades have won increases of appreciable amounts in recent years, the administrative class in the higher ranges has received no addition to its earnings since 1951.

The shortfall in the number of candidates presenting themselves for examination for the clerical class has been very striking since the end of the war. Many candidates who would prior to 1939 have competed for clerical class posts now aspire to the executive class, for which the number of candidates is still about the same as in pre-war days, though the quality is not so high. The growth in University education has led to an increase in candidates for the administrative class. While the number of competitors for administrative posts has declined since 1951, when 718 competed compared with 644 in 1953, 655 in 1954, and 474 in 1955, the examinations still attract a higher number than in pre-war days. The cream, however, is lacking.

Government administration must rely principally on the highest class for policy and overall direction. Recruitment of good candidates to other classes will continue to be important, but the ability to find suitable men and women to occupy posts in the administrative class is essential if standards are to be maintained.

An enquiry into the Civil Service in 1874 reported: 'It may well be doubted if any examination can effectively test

CIVIL SERVICE RECRUITMENT

189

a man's real and permanent capacity for the business of life,' but it strongly favoured written tests as the best and fairest method of picking candidates for State employment. In recent years, open entrants to the executive class must, in addition to competing in a written examination, show their paces before a selection board, which awards a number of marks for personal qualities. These marks, added to the marks scored in the written examination, determine the final placing, but are not enough to lead to the rejection of a man or woman who has done well in the first part of the competition.

Much greater weight is attached to personal qualities so far as recruits to the administrative class are concerned. Entry is by two methods. Under Method I candidates compete in a written examination, lasting several days, and then appear before a selection board which has at its disposal a proportion of marks capable of making all the difference between success and failure. Under Method II the written examination is not competitive; it is of a qualifying kind, restricted to candidates who have obtained a First or Second Class Honours degree. The decisive tests come later, when applicants undergo two or three days under the watchful eyes of assessors who report at length on the candidates' suitability to a final selection board set up by the Civil Service Commission.

Method II, the country-house method so called, since it was first started in a comfortable country mansion, is experimental. Opinions are strongly divided on its efficacy in picking out the right men and women to enter the highest class of the Civil Service and by whom in the course of the next twenty or thirty years the most senior and responsible posts must be filled. In 1951 the Civil Service Commissioners, in a 'Memorandum on the Use of the Civil Service Selection Board,' described the arrangements for Method II, and the changes which have since taken place have been relatively slight. In addition to psychological tests, a number of intelligence tests are applied by the assessors, aimed 'at measuring the ability essential to such processes as analysing, reasoning, and drawing correct inferences. They are not concerned with such aspects of personality as the will, the emotions or imagination, or originality, and they do not particularly aim at assessing acquired knowledge, nor do they indicate more than one of the many

elements in a candidate's working efficiency. What they do is to help to throw light on intellectual potentialities.' The assessors also use projection tests 'to deal with such matters as attitude, interest, ambition, temperament, and character, and not, as in the case of intelligence tests, with primarily intellectual factors. Their purpose is to present a task into the doing of which the candidate will probably throw, or "project" some indication of his own personality.' Since most higher Civil Servants are condemned to spend much of their time in committee work, candidates take part in tests to show whether they are likely to make satisfactory chairmen or members of committees, and a report on these and other tests is passed to the final selection board. The Foreign Office is, as usual, different. It does not permit any of the senior staff to come in by way of Method I and insists that new entrants for the senior branch should face up to the ordeals of Method II. The majority of successful candidates to this branch of the Foreign Office came from Oxford or Cambridge.

Many people doubted whether a Royal Commission on the Civil Service was necessary in 1953. Civil Service conditions and remuneration used to remain unaltered for long periods, and a Royal Commission was a convenient method of reviewing them and of affording the staff an opportunity to represent their views. The position is now very different. Civil Servants, except those in the higher grades, carry their claims for improvement in salary and conditions to an arbitration tribunal, if they cannot obtain satisfaction otherwise; and the staff associations are consulted on most aspects of the work and have a right to see instructions before issue and to express their views on their terms. So far as it relates to the salaries of the senior officials, the report of the recent Royal Commission has been welcomed by Civil Servants, but those in other grades have shown themselves very critical and seem to feel that the normal arbitration machinery would have been more favourable to them.

Security of tenure, excellent superannuation benefits, and relatively good salaries, with an assurance of steady progression, have been the magnets which in earlier years produced a flow of adequate and more than adequate candidates to Government service. Other employers, however, now equal or come very close to matching these

advantages. The seven-hour day and the long holidays—as much as eight weeks for some grades—which once distinguished the Service were abandoned as a temporary measure at the beginning of the last war, and the recent Royal Commission recommends that they should not be restored, though it proposes that Civil Servants should come into line with many commercial houses and work only one Saturday out of every two.

Unless the country experiences large-scale unemployment or circumstances change considerably otherwise, it seems unlikely that the Civil Service will ever again have the keen competition for its posts as in pre-war years. So far as the executive and clerical grades are concerned, this may not be a matter for regret. Much of the work performed by these classes was probably well below the capacity of many of their members, and the frustrating effect of this has been one of the main causes of the discontentment which spread through Whitehall; it was also one of the reasons why many Civil Servants turned to spare-time occupations which became more important than their official duties. Others devoted themselves fiercely to trade union activity, and the Civil Service staff associations were among the best organised in the country and produced a number of the most effective industrial leaders.

The increases recommended for the higher grades may, if adopted, attract some of the best graduates who now seek their careers in commerce and industry. Other professions offer more glittering prizes for the successful than the Civil Service does, but Government service holds out certainties. The man who passes the administrative examination will be grossly inefficient if he does not reach assistant secretary level and will be unlucky if he fails to become an under secretary, and those who reach the grade of permanent secretary can expect a knighthood as a matter of course when their turn comes and, if the Royal Commission's proposals are adopted, will receive 6,000*l.* per annum and retire on a pension of 3,000*l.* a year, plus a tax-free gratuity of 9,000*l.* at sixty years of age.

The prestige of the Service has declined rapidly since the last war, partly as a result of the criticism of Crichton Down and other instances of official arrogance and partly because so many people are now able to assess its work. Young men and women who feel confident of their abilities may

well hesitate before committing themselves to a career in a Service which often gives the impression of favouring mediocrity and which is so mercilessly ridiculed for its outworn machinery and its rigidity. But the Civil Service has one enormous advantage in this country. While the reservoir from which they could pick and choose has dried up to some extent, once the departments have encircled them, their staff are fixtures. When they have smelt the superior air of a Government department, been clothed with a measure of official authority, and learned to savour the acid jokes of Whitehall, Civil Servants rarely banish themselves willingly from the atmosphere, however impatient they may feel from time to time at the constant niggling. Ensconced in the comfortable anonymity of a Government office, they shudder at the thought of launching themselves into the outside world, which looks to them cold and formidable and over-hearty and which expects balance sheets to show a profit.

Officials do not escape some measure of competition, but the contest is mild and gentlemanly and confined to other like-minded people, who have been suitably disciplined. The Civil Servant enjoys what amounts to a firm assurance of steady progression from grade to grade without much really serious exertion on his part. And he quickly falls under the fascination of paperasserie, a fascination which develops with the years until the addict hardly dare contemplate existence without this heady drug and the exhilaration of departmental battle.

G. A. CAMPBELL.

Art. 5.—THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF REGULAR
ENLISTMENTS.

THE reasons for the difficulty in finding the right men for regular engagements are many, but some weigh more heavily than others. With full employment, high wages, and benevolent social services in civilian life, the unspectacular monetary rewards in the regular forces appear to the average man to be less enticing. He, too often, overlooks the many payments in kind which are offered. These, however, as far as medical aid are concerned, are less of an attraction than they used to be. To be well clothed and fed, housed and cared for physically and mentally are factors which are not given enough value in the mind of the potential regular. The Welfare State has made these things a commonplace.

Thus, to earn competitive wages in the civilian world appears to be the safer course to many who under economic pressure would have made one of the services their life's career. But often even these are insufficient reasons for the man who has to make the choice. It has been found from the various enquiries made into unrest in industry, that claims for advances in wages often mask dissatisfaction with the 'climate,' as it were, in which the men work. They do not seem to matter enough, as individuals, in the great impersonal concerns. Their work is often monotonous and repetitive and leaves no real opportunity for satisfying craftsmanship nor of producing that wholeness of personality which the more primitive occupations usually did.

There is a lesson here for us in the regular services. I have found that the men always responded with enthusiasm to tasks which were constructive and real. The 'digging a hole and filling it' idea of occupying our men is barren in conception and destroying to the soul. As an example of this truth, I will quote an experience during the late war. In a situation where it was essential that all camp sewage should be burnt so as to protect the water supplies, this repellant task was performed with obvious distaste and reluctance. But when we designed and built a brick destructor which was fired by an improvised appliance using waste sump-oil, atomised by water, as a fuel, the situation was dramatically changed. Some of the change may have

been the effect of a vestige of ancient fire worship, but for the most part it was interest in the development of this destructor and its successful application to an unpleasant task which made the difference. The men had become technicians and they displayed the keenest interest in the experimental work. It is this kind of contact with the tasks of the day in the services which will help to make men feel that they are something more than regimental numbers.

The cultivation and use of personal interests and values are to-day essential to military efficiency. We have to change almost entirely the conception behind the training of a soldier for unquestioning and automatic obedience as applied appropriately to fighting in the squares at Waterloo. Modern armaments and the mechanisation of armies, the threat of nuclear weapons of vast destructive power, and the combination of operations always with air power and often also with naval power, make it imperative that the individual soldier remains an individual who has a good conception both of his tactical rôle as well as of the strategic plan. Armies, in any future wars between great powers, will have to find cohesion within wide dispersal. The demands for sound thinking and right action will descend to the smallest groups. For such groups to function intelligently and successfully means, even now, a change in our attitude towards the individual soldier.

It may be asked how does this affect whether a soldier will stay in the service for a long engagement. The answer is that a career which gives an opportunity for personal satisfaction, that uses personal values in its demands, and which makes the man feel that he *belongs* will be powerful in its appeal. The British soldier is a member of no mean army. The traditional over-emphasis upon the stamping of feet, the 'square bashing,' the 'bawling out' of nervous recruits by purple-faced sergeants ought now to be safely buried among other mistakes of the past.

In this aspect of army life the reactions of the National Service man are especially important. National Service entrants are a cross-section of the whole community. Many of them have received a higher education. Their general level of intelligence is that of the civilian community from which they come. National Service men are often critical of their stay in the Army. It has been my duty

to aid in the interview of thousands of ex-National Service men for appointments in civilian life. In reply to the question of how did they like their service, the main criticism is that after the extremely interesting initial basic training, service life tended to become a futility and to lack purposeful activity, and this made it boring. Peace-time service must remain purposeful, active in connection with real things and not a mere standing by in the terms of an insurance for defence. Digging out plantains with a pen-knife from the officers' mess lawn—which was one task given as an example of futile service—is not the way to employ the active hours of grown men. This problem of boredom and lack of reality must be solved. When it is, then more National Service men will remain as Regulars.

How can this be done? Many units, especially those in actual formations, have gone a long way towards providing in peacetime the drive, interest, and fascination of active service. Schemes, experiments, the intensive use of maps on the ground and the encouragement in the production of 'gadgets' and improvisations of all kinds will help. It will need much drive on the part of the officers and much consultation together. Napoleon once said that there were no bad soldiers, only bad officers. Officers should enter much more than they do into the off-parade activities of the men. They should go rock climbing, bird watching, botanising, archaeologising together. This would enhance the status of the officer who is fit for his rank. The experimental work in cold regions, in under-water exploration and so on, recently undertaken by groups of Royal Marines Commandos (officers and men working together) illustrates what I mean. Activities which are real, purposeful, and capable of sustaining interests not only will make the unit which uses them a happier one, but also, having in mind the demands of modern warfare, a more efficient one.

Nowadays, the great majority of regulars are married or hope to be and a man's decision to stay in or leave the service is almost always a reflection of the family point of view, especially that of the wife. Creditable improvements in the provision of married-quarters have been made of recent years, but one wonders if the segregation of service families has been the soundest policy. Often in these communities the Army rank is reflected in the status of the wives, and that is not a good thing. Such groupings

of families in certain military areas may have been inevitable, but in or near towns it would have been better in many respects to have merged the service married-quarters into civilian housing. In this way, the atmosphere of a one-type community with its limitations and its often petty squabbles could be avoided to a large extent. The linking of married-quarters to particular stations may not, on balance, be the most suitable way of allocating houses to service families. The frequent postings of men and units which are necessary to-day cause too many moves and too great a sense of insecurity in the families. They cannot feel settled for long enough and many hanker after that condition which civilian life can more readily give. If married-quarters were associated with civilian housing and security of tenure ensured during the regular engagement of the man, this fact, coupled with a more generous issue of free travel warrants, could, to many families, make long service in the armed forces more attractive. There is need for a sympathetic enquiry into the attitudes and opinions of those who live in the service married-quarters in relation to the encouragement of longer regular engagements. Furthermore, there should be legislation, irrespective of other demands, to secure for the regular service man coming to the end of his engagement a high priority in the allocation of a civilian house. This has a counterpart in the resettlement of the service man himself into civilian employment.

Associated with the housing of service families is the schooling of the children coming from such homes. Every effort should be made to merge their education into the educational system administered by the local education authorities. It is true, I believe, to say that children who still are in the army primary schools, taught separately from their contemporaries, subject to many moves and changes of teachers, and not always in school buildings as well staffed and equipped as their civilian counterparts, are handicapped in the educational race. Longer settlements in one place, the merging of housing and schooling into the civilian pattern where this is by any means possible, would help service families not to feel so much that their life is apart from the workaday world. It is the demand from the mothers in the service married-quarters to return to this civilian world which prevents many an engagement from being extended when that opportunity comes.

But boarding-schools carry a *cachet* of their own and I should like to see service boarding-schools increased in number very considerably. I believe that a scheme for the three services jointly would be best, then no label, that might not have all the status it should in the civilian mind, could be applied to such boarding-schools. They could be new 'Imperial Service Colleges' and be staffed with teachers of the highest quality paid at rates above those prevailing in the civilian day schools. The success of 'the Army's own public school'—the Duke of York's Royal Military School at Dover—since its reorganisation in 1947—shows what can be done. There, the old military organisation as originally laid down was altered to bring the life and teaching in the school more into line with the modern boarding-school. Education now takes first place, although the military link between the 'Sons of the Brave' is maintained. These schools should be open to the children of all ranks and not be restricted to those of non-commissioned officers and men. But such schools—for girls as well as boys—should prepare their pupils for all openings in life and not restrict them to the services. Many of the boys would, however, by way of the service technical schools and such places as Welbeck College, move naturally towards long regular engagements and, indeed, the most suitable to regular commissions. Such service colleges could help to produce many of the technicians which our society and our industrial structure require so urgently. They would ultimately repay their cost generously in social and economic values. Just as a purposeful, active and individual approach to the training and duties of National Service men in the armed forces has a crucial effect upon their attitude towards the making of the service their life's career, so in a different way the manner in which the school pre-service units do their work has an important effect upon many who may contemplate regular engagements in the fighting services. There is a suspicion in my mind that, in the pre-service units, the attempt is too often unwisely made to reproduce in them precisely the conditions of training which are appropriate only to the adult soldier.

It is interesting that in the selection of young men for training at Sandhurst as officers for the Regular Army, the practical tests do not include barrack square situations. The tests are designed to discover whether these young men

have common sense, initiative, good humour, and can intelligently respond to a difficult situation and co-operate harmoniously with one another. The tests are for character and general adaptability rather than for 'military' quality as such. The selection of leaders is made more on a wide basis of character than upon the narrow, rigid one of ceremonial drills and weapon training.

This pre-training should consist partly of practical work and partly of theory. These two aspects should be correlated in every way possible and the reasons behind every activity discussed and illustrated: e.g., in the training which covers camp sanitation, the elementary principles of personal and communal hygiene should be dealt with. The practical problem should give rise to the theoretical considerations implied in its solution rather than that theoretical lectures be given *in vacuo*.

Examples of practical activities which are invaluable in training are the use and making of maps; touring the countryside using a map to check against the land formations, roads, rivers, and railways; the care of the cycle and its proper use; the selection of a camp site for large and small numbers; the layout of a suitable camp system of sanitation; the importance of water supplies for washing and drinking and precautions as to its purity; cloud formations and weather signs; simple meteorology; forest lore; precautions against forest fires; rock climbing; crossing obstacles by improvised means; observations of rocks, plants, and animals; recording data by sketches and photographs; youth hostelry and proper dress for rambles and tours.

The aim is to develop an awareness and understanding of environment. In the theory every master at the school can help in his particular way. The geography master can deal with maps and also discuss the geography behind the tensions of the world situations. The history master can explain much of the world's political difficulties and set the United Nations and other associations of power in perspective. The science master can deal with mechanisms, simple practical improvisations, the internal combustion engine, and so forth. The English master can help to develop powers of written expression in the description of terrain and in reports.

The Army itself is the best place for the formal practices,

but in its young entrants, potential, flexibility of mind, and interests are more important than skill in the manipulation of small arms or in ceremonial drill. 'Drill' with small arms in pre-service units should be approached from the angle of the need for uniformity of motions as necessary to the safe carrying by bodies of men of lethal weapons, than from the precise needs of ceremonial. This kind of approach would do much to neutralise the objections to the 'military training of youth' and have the advantage not only of producing entrants in the services capable of responding there to the more professional military activities and of providing a high proportion of leaders, but in making more competent and interested citizens.

We should develop girls' pre-service units with similar ideas in mind, these ideas being adapted to the difference of sex, with nursing added.

This brings us to the clear aims which the services should have in mind to prepare regulars for resettlement into civilian life when that time comes. This entails, first, the development of the man's whole personality, education, and skill and his preparation, actively, for a qualification, however modest, to enable his entry ultimately into some craft, trade, business, or profession. It is important that this aim should be a conscious one from the very start of the period of regular service. The plan of action for each individual must be suited to his background and capabilities and be within his compass. The present-day psychological tests so widely applied in the various selection stages, and the educational grading of every sailor, soldier, or airman which is now done as a routine, will provide those in control with the necessary personal data.

But there is the danger of this work of the personal development of every man and his preparation ultimately for civilian life being left to the educational branch alone. Its members are too few to keep the close personal touch which is necessary in such a plan. All officers and indeed senior non-commissioned officers capable of helping should be in on this. The platoon or squadron leader must be a sort of house-master and be concerned, actively, with, not only the military competence of his charges, but in their development as citizens as well. Only then will the facilities offered by the education branches of the services and of the local education authorities be effective.

This calls for a new outlook for many officers. It is true that the welfare side of service life has become well established, but here again there is the tendency to assume that because someone is nominated as officer in charge of welfare all can be left to him. Officers must be in *loco parentis* in every way possible to the men under their command. Their military training, personal welfare, further education or training in craftsmanship, and their preparation for, ultimately, a return to civilian life competent to undertake some worth-while employment there, should be the concern of every officer and not merely the specialist advisers. The services must 'lead somewhere' if they are to have a widespread fundamental appeal. The regular should be able to end his service and re-enter civilian life *at least* no worse off in all circumstances than his non-service contemporaries, and I would, indeed, argue that there is a strong case for putting him in a privileged position.

Examples from my experience will illustrate this point. I have been present at the interviewing of many hundreds of ex-regulars. Many of the candidates, with perhaps twenty to thirty years' regular service, had been technicians of various kinds, especially in the Royal Navy and Royal Air Force. They were experts *from the service point of view* on mechanical and electrical engineering, radio and radar, shipwright work, internal combustion engines, aircraft, and so on. Now in their forties they sought to be employed in administrative or office duties. To the question why the applicants did not seek to continue as civilians with their specialised knowledge and skill there were usually two answers given. One was that, though their qualifications as technicians were recognised in the service by emoluments and rank, these carried little or no weight in civilian life for appointments carrying approximately a similar status. (The men were not especially concerned with wages, as a rule.) The second answer, less usual, was that they were tired of engines, radio sets, aircraft, all that sort of thing, and desired a change.

It is clear that a comprehensive scheme for linking up technical qualifications in the services with those recognised in civilian life is long overdue. This means the trade unions, the technical institutions, and the service authorities getting together to work out a scheme. There is no reason why the best of our service electrical engineers should not,

during the period of their regular engagements, qualify for the Membership of the Institute of Electrical Engineers or, at least, prepare as a matter of course for the National and Higher National Certificates in Electrical Engineering ; and so for Mechanical Engineering, Building, Aircraft Engineering, and other branches of technology.

Similarly, the clerical or business-minded service man could prepare himself for his future as a civilian—all types of qualifications should be kept in mind. It is true that much excellent work is being done by the correspondence courses organised by the Army for all three services. There is need for greater direction, greater precision, and greater encouragement for these and other courses leading to qualifications of all possible types for men serving long, regular engagements. True, the proportion of men capable of attaining the higher technical and educational qualifications will not be large and that means perhaps 80 per cent. of people left with more modest abilities. Many of this bulk group are capable of training as craftsmen, making sure that, where they prepare for trades controlled by unions, these unions and the potential employers are in on the scheme both to give advice and also to enable their recognition of the tradesman in his trade when he becomes a civilian.

It is likely that, except among the officers and a selected group of senior non-commissioned officers, preparation for one of the learned professions is seldom a possibility, although the exception must always be looked for. With the aid of the education officers, correspondence courses, and local education authority classes it is certain that a considerable number of members of the services could prepare during the period of their regular engagements for the secretarial, legal, teaching, and similar professions. At least such service students could break the back of the work, leaving, perhaps, a final phase to be tackled when the regular engagement ends. Special intensive courses would have to be arranged.

Perhaps it is in the selection of our regular officers that differences of opinion will most strongly appear. The press, often without full possession of the facts, at times dilates upon the prejudices of the 'Blimps' in the services who carry out the work of selection. The work as a whole is done conscientiously, efficiently, and without conscious

prejudice within the terms of reference of the selection boards. In recent years a greater emphasis has been laid upon intelligence and educational potential than has, at times, been customary. Character tests, the validity of which is sometimes questioned, are the controlling factor once the intellectual and educational levels have been established as sufficient. It is here, perhaps, that some criticism can be usefully offered. To select young men of eighteen for training as regular officers for what are now very much democratised services, selection boards are probably over-weighted with members who have a well-to-do background. They are excellent people within their lights, but they inevitably tend to look for someone like themselves. It is true to say that if a boy from Eton expresses an opinion in a discussion at the selection board and another does so using precisely the same words but in a broad Bradford accent, the impression upon the board is in each case different. Except for fair-sized intakes from Scotland (Scottish education and accent are acceptable) it is true to say that the great mass of officers for the British army is drawn from young men whose homes lie in those counties south of a line from Swansea to the Wash. True, the mass of applicants is also from the same region, and this is not so much a matter of accent and the social graces as of tradition both in family and in school in the southern parts of Great Britain.

However, the grammar school candidate seems in practice to stand somewhat less chance of selection than the public-school boy. This is not so much a matter of prejudice on the part of the selectors but rather that at the public schools the boys are more likely to develop early the kind of character qualities which the selection boards regard as those most suitable in regular officers. I believe that not enough is allowed for the effects of training in such places as Sandhurst in bringing out the character qualities and social graces which in other cases the public schools have already done. We should be ready more often to 'take a chance' with the less socially developed grammar-school boy who is otherwise intelligent enough and of high educational level. I should put head-masters and non-public-school men on the selection boards along with regular officers.

The effect of the often exaggerated and over-cultivated public-school accent upon the minority of grammar-school

boys in a selection board group can be quite devastating. The grammar-school boy retires into his shell, is disinclined to speak, and tends to take second place behind those who speak in the accepted way, and they perform badly and below their real potential. This handicap must somehow be eliminated. Future war will require not the right accent or membership of the right families but all the brains and ability of the whole nation. In an enquiry, the U.S. Army Command discovered that the quality which the rank and file valued most of all in their officers was competence in the job. Qualities and abilities calling for a vastly higher level of knowledge, of quicker thinking, and of technical ability are now necessary in the vast complex of modern warfare. We *must* give weight to ability and intelligence as compared with character factors. In any event, while we can assess pretty well intelligence and education, our character tests are far less objective and are bound to be coloured too much by the personal background and opinions of the one applying them. So often does 'the stone which the builder rejected' become 'the headstone of the corner.' Horatio Nelson as a youth would not have been likely to pass a modern selection board. We have much to learn here and we must apply ourselves, in officer selection, to a task of extreme difficulty with due modesty. So often the *gauche*, awkward, inarticulate youth of eighteen is at twenty-five, after experience and training, a vastly different person.

There is a point to be made about the selection of regular officers for the technical branches of the services. I speak with experience only of Army selection. It was frequently found with technically qualified applicants, direct from civil life, who applied for the regular commissions then offered in the R.E., and the R.E.M.E. in particular, that in larger proportions than in other groups they failed in the personality and character tests. It seemed as if their strenuous preparation for technical qualifications had cut them off from the society in which they lived. This meant that certain social graces, cultural interests and experience of life and of people, because of the intensity of their studies, had been denied them. They suffered from a lack of the liberalising effect of the humanistic studies and this showed itself in their attitudes and general personal relationships. Yet I still think we should have taken more

chances and saw to it that the somewhat raw technicians were posted to units with wise and discerning commanding officers. With the right sympathy, encouragement, and environment, those hard-working men, who had had their noses too long on the grindstone of an intense and narrow technical education, might well have blossomed into officers who could be at home and at ease in all the conditions of regular service. The use of probationary periods might have helped us here.

Theoretically, selection boards were expected to apply the same requirements as to their estimates of character qualities in respect of applicants for all corps in the Army. Education, Pay Corps, and other, primarily, 'non-combatant' officers were tested in the same way as an applicant for the Guards Brigade. Up to a point the principle is sound, but in practice, in all types of units, variations in human material are inevitable. We must always remember that the demands upon different officers vary enormously in the highly technical Army of to-day. The 'all-rounder' is rare, and brilliant as he may be, he would stand to be advised by his technical experts. There is such a subdivision of duties in the modern fighting services that we cannot afford to insist upon every applicant for a regular commission to measure up to some absolute and arbitrary standard which, in fact, is derived from the simpler type of colonial wars. We ought to fit the various sorts into the variety of jobs rather than seek for entrants of a preconceived, universal type. In the light of this argument, it is interesting to note that there has been a tendency recently to consider technical applicants in relation to a set of standards specially applicable to them. Perhaps a fuller use should be made of the system followed in the R.A.M.C. of starting off with short-service commissions with those wishing to become regular officers and confirming them, when the entrants have proved themselves suitable, in their regular engagements. This should increase the present intake of regular officers for the technical arms. The conditions governing the granting of regular commissions to selected other ranks or ratings seem to need further examination so as to see how far suitable and sound intakes from these sources to regular commissions can be enlarged. The ranker officer unperturbed with his origin and *competent* in his duties will be popular and suitable in any mess of real

men who are keen on the service and do not regard it as a kind of exclusive social club.

In connection with regular officer training, I would put in a plea for increasing the number of young subalterns who are selected to undertake at Cambridge or at the Military College of Science courses leading to degrees. I would advocate using all our universities in this scheme and not only Cambridge and (externally) London. This would act as an advertisement for, in this instance, the Army. I would like to see such courses leading also to degrees in Arts in which Modern Languages, Geography, Political Science and History would be of special military value. Thus more regular officers capable while in the service of taking a university degree would be increased with beneficial effect upon officer recruitment from the best material. This has an obvious bearing upon the resettlement of officers, retiring perhaps as majors or equivalent rank, twenty years or so later. At present, unless such regular officers have made themselves qualified in other directions as advocated earlier in this essay, their resettlement into civilian appointments, commensurate with their rank and status, becomes very difficult indeed. It is this fear that makes many a bright young National Service man hesitate before he considers the possibility of standing for selection to be trained as a regular officer. Once the services cease to mean a blind end in their forties for the majority of all ranks, then I believe we shall not lack recruits of the best type because it is this best type which is able to look so far ahead and weigh the ultimate consequences of enlistment for long regular engagements. These are the men the services need but they will not get them, in sufficient numbers under present-day economic conditions, unless the dead end on retirement is removed.

There is one thing that ought to be said, which probably applies to the Army in particular, and that is the distorted and absurd representation of the services as depicted in certain films and plays. We can take a joke as well as most people, but some of the caricatures of officers and men in such representations do have undoubtedly a bad effect on recruiting men for regular service. We should seek the co-operation of writers, artists, and producers to be more true to the facts and avoid the bringing of the services unnecessarily into disrepute.

We shall achieve our end when we give the services a status by making the life therein purposeful, active, interesting, and constantly dealing with actualities. We must plan so that the regular develops into a citizen ready and able to fit into civilian life later on without loss of personal values. We must provide, indeed press for, the education and training necessary to this full personal development and make its encouragement the duty of every officer and not merely of the specialists. We must try to solve the problems of service men's families and remove, if we can, the causes of their dissatisfaction with service life. And, somehow, we must continue to build up in the country the feeling that the services are an essential and well-beloved part of our life carrying a status which is universally recognised. While monetary reward is important, I believe that more imponderable things enter into the question. We must work to integrate the services more closely into our society and be not a thing apart.

FREDERIC EVANS.

Art. 6.—LITERATURE VERSUS CELIBACY.

THE CHURCH and literature are so closely allied that the decisions of the former have greatly influenced the latter. One of the most important decrees in the history of English fiction has been the thirty-second article of the Church of England : ' Bishops, Priests and Deacons are not commanded by God's Law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage ; therefore it is lawful also for them as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.'

That article represents a triumph of Church over Crown. It is certain that it must have been opposed, with considerable force and acerbity, by the so-called Virgin Queen, who intensified her habitual dislike of matrimony for others by a particular hatred of marriage for the clergy. But had it not been for that triumph our literature would have lacked more than one genius, and a rich gallery of portraits of clergy-wives.

There would have been no Jane Austen : a disaster too great for contemplation ; no Brontës ; no Lewis Carroll ;—and no ' Alice ' either, for the original and namesake of that immortal child was the daughter of a Very Reverend Dean of Christ Church. Sir Walter Scott would have had to find a son-in-law other than Lockhart, who was the son of a Presbyterian manse ; Tennyson and Matthew Arnold would have remained unborn. It can, of course, be argued that the reverend fathers of those geniuses might have refrained from becoming reverend and become merely fathers, though still in lawful, secular wedlock. But had they been deterred from Holy Orders by the discipline of celibacy they would not have been quite the men they were ; his calling shapes a man. They could not have been quite the same as lawyers, doctors, or squires.

At one remove we should have lacked Robert Louis Stevenson, grandson of the Rev. Lewis Balfour of Colinton, who lives for us in the essay on ' The Manse ' ; Kipling, who shares with the late Earl Baldwin and with the children of Sir Edward Burne Jones a reverend Scots grandsire. Margaret Burne-Jones married a minister's son, J. W. Mackail, so there is a considerable infusion of theology in the mental heritage of Angela Thirkell and of Denis

Mackail. A Scots manse produced two much-loved and utterly contrasting novelists, John Buchan and his sister 'O. Douglas'; and another those unjustly neglected collaborators, Mary and Jane Findlater.

It is ironical that the Church of England should, on occasion, have lost sons of the clergy to Rome and to schism: the Wesleys took with them into their own new sect a spiritual wealth that the Church in their day grievously lacked; to-day Mgr Knox devotes his brilliance to the Church of his adoption; yesterday Robert Hugh Benson, the son of an Archbishop, transferred his allegiance, and wrote a series of vivid novels in defence of his faith.

Mrs Wesley and Mrs Benson would dominate any portrait-gallery of real clergy-wives; to the former her sons owed much of their ardour, their intellectual force, their blaze of activity. Mrs Benson lives for us in more than one memoir by her son, E. F. Benson. She was one of the most eminent of Victorian women in her own right, as well as by her position; a great lady and a lovable. Queen Victoria appreciated her and treated her with courtesy and friendliness. Her Majesty, unlike Queen Elizabeth, approved of a married clergy. But it is fascinating to speculate on Mrs Benson's reply, had she lived three centuries earlier, to the Tudor virago whose manners were no better than her morals. Archbishop Parker was, according to the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' happy in his marriage. In showing hospitality, as enjoined by St Paul, 'he was materially aided by his wife, whose tact and genial disposition signally fitted her for such duties.' She entertained Queen Elizabeth with much grace and dignity, which was acknowledged in that classic impertinence: 'Madam I may not call you; Mistress I am ashamed to call you; but yet I thank you.'

It is easy to think of retorts, but most of them would have led to the Tower. Mrs Parker, no doubt, remained discreetly silent; her comments in private were, one hopes, adequate. But Mrs Benson would have been able to reply in a phrase and manner that would not have endangered her husband or herself, but would have penetrated even a Tudor hide.

Parson Austen's wife appears to have been a brisk, cheerful, and pleasant lady, possibly a prototype of Mrs Morland in 'Northanger Abbey'; Mrs Brontë fades out of

the family picture too soon, delicate and exhausted, but she brought her share of Celtic fire and imagination to her brilliant children.

The most elegant of clergy-wives is, undoubtedly, Mrs Moberly, wife of the Headmaster of Winchester and friend of Charlotte Yonge. Her fifteen children, all gifted and devoted and happy, provided that novelist of the school-room with a family background in which she found both realism and inspiration for her creations. Whether or not they are actually portrayed in some of her characters, they were the stimulus she needed and their very existence was important, perhaps essential, to her achievement. But among her memorable portraits she painted none so exquisite as that of the real Mrs Moberly as recalled by her daughter.

She was beautiful, graceful, and refined beyond any concept of our rough generation ; fastidious in every sense. She dressed in silk and had all her gowns sewn with silk on both sides. When asked what difference cotton thread on the inside would make, she replied : ' I should know it was cotton and I should not like that.' Her rooms smelt of pot-pourri and lavender and verbena ; flower-scents she loved, but no strong perfumes or odours. She never, if she could help it, handled copper coins ; and used to wash the gold and silver destined for the offertory in church. It is difficult to contemplate her in a modern servantless household ; yet these delicate Victorians had an element of steel in them and an amazing resourcefulness. Mrs Moberly might well have maintained her elegance even while doing chores.

The portrait-gallery of fiction would have been sadly lacking in female sitters without the clergy-wives. As it is, it is rich and varied : dominated at one end by Mrs Proudie, at the other by Mrs Norris. These ladies glare at each other with suspicion tempered with respect for a worthy rival ; enhanced, on Mrs Norris's part, with the deference due to an ecclesiastical superior who has influence in the matter of preferment ; on Mrs Proudie's with a snobbish liking for the sister-in-law of a baronet. These ladies would have found much in common and it is hardly possible to decide which of the two would have suggested more economies or acquired more perquisites.

They are both detestable, and it is a matter of choice which is the more so. Personally I dislike Mrs Norris more

than almost any woman I have ever known, more than Mrs Proudie and nearly as much as Queen Elizabeth. Mrs Proudie is rather more in the grand manner of hatefulness; she is superb, immortal in her meanness and aggressiveness, her bullying and bad manners. One of the great sayings of fiction is also one of the briefest: Mr Crawley's 'Peace, woman' in that memorable scene in the Palace at Barchester. We must forgive our enemies, but it is hard for lovers of Trollope to pardon those chattering fools in the Athenæum whose criticism, overheard by the author, caused Trollope to kill Mrs Proudie. We cannot believe in her mortality; like King Arthur, she still lives, though hidden. Is not her hand to be seen in such vagaries as the occasional demand for a female clergy?

Jane Austen does not even hint at the decease, however remote, of Mrs Norris. That lady, unlike Mrs Proudie, does not exercise and express herself *ex officio* as a clergy-wife, her husband making no appearance in 'Mansfield Park' and dying before the story has well begun. But a little reflection will show that a parson was the only likely husband for her. She *might* have married a squire; but then she would not have come to live in a cottage across the park, within such easy distance of the mansion. As a squire's widow she would most probably have returned to the dower-house on her late husband's estate and lived there to harass the heir and his wife.

It is tempting to amplify Jane Austen's brief account of the Norris romance. Miss Ward used to come on long and frequent visits to her sister and Sir Thomas, and there she met her brother-in-law's friend, Mr Norris. She was a good-looking woman, and in that setting was not unamiable in manner. Her awe of Sir Thomas subdued her; she lived in luxury; and even she could not quarrel with Lady Bertram. So Mr Norris found her an agreeable and sympathetic listener; he was fussy about his health and she recommended remedies for all his complaints; advised him to take care of himself; agreed with all his opinions on Church affairs. He began to think he might do worse than marry; the lady, he believed, had a moderate portion. Then Lady Bertram took a hand; even her placid good nature was within measuring distance of being tired of her sister, and of her constant interference in the bringing-up of little Tom and Edmund and Baby Maria.

'I tell you what, Sir Thomas,' she said one night, as they lay in the four-poster discussing the lamented death of their old vicar, 'you must give the living to Mr Norris, and he shall marry my sister. I do not suppose he is likely to live above twenty years or so, and by that time little Edmund will be ready to take Orders and succeed him.'

'An excellent suggestion, my love,' replied Sir Thomas. 'I shall write to Norris to-morrow, and to the Bishop. It is a good living and a good parsonage, and they will be very comfortable.'

Mr Norris accepted with alacrity, the Bishop approved; Miss Ward, on being offered Mr Norris's hand, heart, and name, likewise accepted. They were married by the Bishop, and the bride given away by Sir Thomas, and after the wedding-breakfast at Mansfield Park departed for their honeymoon in Bath; where Mr Norris took the waters, and where their nuptial raptures, if any, will remain undescribed by the spinster modesty of the present writer.

However intensely one may dislike Mrs Norris it is not necessary to believe that she was a bad wife; she may not have been like Mrs Proudie in that way. She was, most probably, very careful of her husband's health and certainly of his finances; she encouraged him to take care of himself and put importunate parishioners in their place. Like Lady Catherine de Burgh, she doubtless 'sallied forth into the village to settle their differences, silence their complaints, and scold them into harmony and plenty.' Perhaps she also wrote her husband's sermons for him. The congregation would know which were hers and which his own unaided efforts; the latter would be long and dull, learned in a dim way, completely and peacefully detached from life; the former direct and pungent, full of recognisable thrusts at individuals. Among the great, unwritten chapters of 'Mansfield Park' is one retailing the views of the women of the parish on Mrs Norris.

She is almost matched in nastiness by Mrs Elton; but that lady has not so many opportunities for making herself a nuisance. Emma can afford to ignore her spitefulness and despise her vulgarity, though she can escape neither; Jane Fairfax, absorbed in her love and misery, is hardly touched by her odious patronage; Miss Bates is too humble and good to perceive her ill breeding and ill nature.

It is essential that she should be the vicar's wife. Only

in that position would she be received by Emma and Mrs Weston. As the wife of the local doctor (suppose Mr Perry to have been unmarried and to have been 'caught' by Miss Augusta Hawkins) or the lawyer or other citizen, she might have been as pushing as she could, she would never have entered the houses of the gentry as a guest.

After the first excitement stirred by her as a bride, she was (one imagines) much criticised and with good reason disliked; she was a snob of the worst kind; rarely visited the good ladies of Highbury whom she considered beneath her, for her gentility was of the anxious and assertive kind that fears to be demeaned. The poor folk she ignored; and she did her husband little good. Left to himself, he was a dutiful parson enough and not unkindly; but she discouraged him from much pastoral visiting.

Old Mrs Bates, on the other hand, was greatly liked and respected, even in her retirement and poverty; she had been a kind vicarage lady. And Miss Bates was popular though sometimes described as a poor, good soul.

Three of Jane Austen's heroines marry clergymen: Elinor Dashwood, Fanny Price, and Catherine Morland; and two of her minor characters, Charlotte Lucas and Henrietta Musgrove. We do not see the marriage of this last young lady, and her husband-to-be, Charles Hayter appears only in the background: indicated as a sensible and amiable fellow, a little too good for Henrietta; but, having got over her brief infatuation for Captain Wentworth, she became, one feels sure, a happy and devoted wife and amiable lady of the vicarage. Charlotte Lucas must have had sense and humour and intelligence or Elizabeth Bennet would not have chosen her as a friend; yet she could bear to marry Mr Collins, which indicates a certain obtuseness. But she was a realist; spinsterhood was not attractive, her suitor was a man of good character and temper, he held a comfortable living and had the prospect of an estate. That he was a fool was no great matter. A woman need not listen much to her husband. Charlotte became a married woman with her own house, garden, and poultry to look after, and the hope of olive-branches. It is probable that she was well liked in the parish, being sensible and good natured; and being placid she put up with Lady Catherine's patronage without being ruffled.

Of the three heroines, Elinor was a model parson's wife. She was kind, competent, patient, and well-mannered—all of which qualities had been developed by her dealing with Marianne. If she became a little dull, that seems inevitable in Edward's company; but she was not without humour and she was not prim—for she got on well with good, hearty, vulgar Mrs Jennings as no prim or humourless person would.

Fanny would be very earnest and conscientious and do anything Edmund asked her, but she would be shy; but the parishioners of Mansfield were probably a decent lot, and Sir Thomas was, one feels certain, a good landlord, so that there would be no squalor. Fanny would shrink from drunkenness and immorality of the popular kind, but these may not have occurred; she would be gentle with old folk and the sick, and generous with soup and shawls, jellies and port wine. It is to be hoped Mrs Norris did not return to Mansfield Park; her future is a problem, for it is unlikely that either she or the erring Maria put up with each other for long. Fanny at the vicarage would be even more open to her attacks than at the Park; but Sir Thomas would probably keep her at a distance. While still at Mansfield one may say that the Grants were liked and respected in their time; the Doctor might not be ardent in his quest of souls, but he was genial, and the local souls did not want to be quested anyhow; and Mrs Grant was a real lady, not like that Madam Norris.

But Mrs Henry Tilney was the best of them all. Catherine is a darling: a silly little darling at one time, but always endearing—loving and loyal, honest, unselfish, well-mannered and humble. Like Fanny, she adored her husband and would do anything to please him; but unlike Fanny she found it easy to make friends among his parishioners. She *liked* people; she listened to everyone, to all their stories—sad or happy, edifying or otherwise—with warm and sincere interest. Everyone could talk to her. The older women, the well-to-do wives of the farmers, of the apothecary, and the lawyer, and the genteel spinsters gave her lots of advice and she was grateful. She might be 'a sadly heedless young housekeeper' at first, but she was eager to learn, and nothing endears youth more to middle-age. She loved to take tea with these good ladies and to entertain them at the vicarage, and the Vicar came too and

made jokes till a body nearly died laughing. He had a way with him, had Vicar. Henry, indeed, though by post-Tractarian standards a sadly heedless young cleric—dashing off to Bath for weeks at a time, and dancing and flirting—was highly popular; he was a delightful visitor—the best of tonics; he preached brief and comprehensible sermons; and after his marriage he was rarely absent from his parish. As he grew older he took a more serious view of his vocation; he had entered Holy Orders lightly enough, as a younger son with a living in the family; but he was influenced by the Oxford Movement when in his fifties. Catherine was captivated; she loved ceremonial and the romance of Catholic teaching and tradition; she urged Henry to some degree of ritualism; and on their visits to London attended the Margaret St. Chapel with awe and delight.

They had six children, all lively, intelligent, healthy, and good looking; mischievous but not spoiled. Henry had a light but firm touch and Catherine, for all her indulgence, would not permit any cruelty or crossness. Their eldest son was a great favourite with his Uncle Frederick, who had sold out of his regiment on his father's death and settled down respectably and peacefully as a bachelor squire; the General, after a few years as a doting grandfather, had died of apoplexy. The second boy, Richard, was extremely clever, with his father's quick mind and wit, his mother's ardour. He took a First in Classics at Oxford, was much influenced by the leaders of the Movement, attending St Mary's regularly to hear Newman preach; and there was, at one time, a fear of his going over to Rome, but this was averted. After holding a London charge for some years (during which he was involved in a ritualist row, to Catherine's mingled terror and admiration) he was appointed to a Cathedral stall, married the Dean's daughter, who shared his church views, and had a charming old house in the close. (It may have been in Barchester under Dean Arabin.) The youngest Tilney boy entered the Navy. Of the three girls, the eldest married her cousin, Eleanor's son; the second a friend of Richard; the third became a Sister in one of the new Anglican communities, and though Catherine missed her dreadfully she was very proud and glad to have a daughter in Religion and she loved to visit the convent.

To return to Barchester. Trollope, like Miss Austen,

portrays good types of vicarage lady with the one notorious exception of Mrs Proudie. His vicarages are even more clear to us than Miss Austen's—except perhaps the Morlands', where we really live for a short time, very comfortably if not luxuriously, for Mrs Morland was an excellent housekeeper. Comfort is taken for granted in her clerical homes, as it was in her own background, and a certain amount of leisure. There are maids enough even in a modest household to do all the housework; Mrs Collins and Mrs Grant alike can sit in the morning with their guests, talking and doing needlework. Mr and Mrs Collins lived quietly, except for their frequent visits to Rosings, 'the style of the neighbourhood' being somewhat beyond their means. But they were not straitened and Charlotte kept a good table.

The Barsetshire parsonages are so varied that they provide one of the most valuable records of clerical life in the nineteenth century. We move from the opulence of Plumstead Episcopi to the penury of Hoggstock, through the quiet comfort of Framley Parsonage. We meet the stately and somewhat worldly Mrs Grantley, who is, however, by no means wanting in heart and grace; like the Archdeacon, she develops these virtues with time, and she has always dignity and discretion. Fanny Robarts is gentle but not weak or colourless; she is aware of her husband's faults, but she will defend him even against Lady Lufton. There is a quiet strength in her, as in her sister-in-law Lucy—who has, besides, so much charm. But the noblest portrait is that of Mrs Crawley: poor, harassed, almost broken-hearted by the troubles that pile upon her, but never broken or even crushed in loyalty or rectitude. She is good to the inmost fibre of her being; she is a lady (to be unashamedly old-fashioned in language) of a breeding to which Mrs Proudie or the Marchioness of Hartleup could never approach within a thousand miles, which they could not begin to discern or imitate; she is worthy of all the praise given to the virtuous woman of the Proverbs—and more, for her virtues flourish in bitter poverty.

The poignancy of the 'Last Chronicle of Barset' lies in the suffering caused Mrs Crawley and her family by Mr Crawley's near-tragedy. *He* could have led a celibate life; and though a devoted he can never have been a comfortable husband. But it is essential to the drama that he should

be married and have a family. The Archdeacon as a celibate would have been a shade harder and more arrogant; but that condition would not greatly have altered the story in 'Barchester Towers,' except that we should have missed the domestic scenes.

Mark Robarts' troubles are complicated, his remorse intensified by the thought of his good wife. But the value of non-celibacy in Trollope is in providing a variety of domestic scenes. His parsons are, most of them, married before we meet them. The only romance we see develop is the very tepid one between Dean Arabin and Eleanor Bold, née Harding, and it is by no means one of the world's great love-stories. We take the author's word for it that they fell in love, and in due course achieved the first cause for which matrimony was ordained; but to put it in our crude modern idiom, we could not care less. Eleanor's chief contribution to the 'Chronicle' is the wretched business of that cheque that nearly destroys Mr Crawley.

For most of Trollope's admirers the Barchester Chronicles are the cream of his work; but defenders of clerical celibacy could well argue that even without these he would be a great novelist. They might add that one of the most delightful even of the Barchesters is without a clerical background; Dr Thorne is one of his most attractive heroes, and Mary as attractive a heroine; his saddest tale (for some, it may be, his sweetest) is about Lily Dale, neither of whose lovers, the faithful or the faithless, is a cleric. But the vicarage—with a married vicar—is always in the background if not in the centre of the picture. A married clergy have made the type of provincial society that Trollope is happy in describing.

A married clergy, indeed, may claim to have influenced the English novel in more than the matter of portraiture of clergy-wives. Could 'The Vicar of Wakefield' have been written about a celibate vicar, with two lovely and wilful nieces instead of daughters? It is doubtful; his nephew might have gone, like Moses, to the fair and bought green spectacles, but only about a wife could he have made the famous comment that he chose her as she her wedding-gown, for qualities that could wear.

Behind and beyond all those scenes of clerical life lies something difficult to analyse: an atmosphere, an *ethos* of a society of which a married clergy is the absolute centre.

Clerical domesticity touched both that of the gentry and aristocracy and that of the common folk : shared certain elements with both, yet was itself, distinctive and apart. It is as important a factor in the development of the middle class in the nineteenth century as their political enfranchisement and the accession of wealth through industrialism. In the vicarage the squire or his lordship could find a breeding and education equal to his own, the education probably superior. The poor parishioners could find a practical sympathy, a knowledge of workaday life beyond what could be expected at the manor or the castle. Parson and parson's lady knew how folk had to live. They might not be poor themselves and they were gentry, but they had to 'manage' and plan a bit.

English fiction reached its zenith in the nineteenth century, especially domestic fiction ; and one minor *genre* was produced with great charm—the *roman jeune fille* or Schoolroom Novel, at its most delightful in the work of Charlotte Yonge. Not all her families, by any means, are clerical ; the most famous, the Mays, are a doctor's children. But the clerical household contains the very essence of perfume that she conveys to us in her novels : that of family life cultivated, pious, affectionate ; rich in treasures of the mind and soul ; rarely wealthy in material things, sometimes indeed poor ; nearly always with a certain voluntary austerity. The graces of middle-class life, that were so nearly destroyed by materialism, are owing in great measure to the vicarage.

The case for and against celibacy can be stated without prejudice or rancour and with equal force on either side. Whether it is an essential part of vocation to the priesthood or itself a separate vocation not necessarily received by all priests is matter for debate. But the lover of English literature, of whatever belief, whatever degree of churchmanship, cannot resist one plea against this celibacy. Had the Anglican clergy remained celibate (with the Scots Presbyterian) we should have lacked a golden catalogue of genius, a portrait-gallery of incomparable charm and variety.

MARION LOCHHEAD.

Art. 7.—BERBERS OF MOROCCO.

THE North African crisis is often seen as an Arab-French quarrel. Recent events have underlined the presence of a third factor—the Berbers. Who are these people, who make up almost half of Morocco's population, and are they a nation ?

The answer is that they have never acted as a nation, knowing only loyalty to a tribe or tribal confederation, never to a ' Berber nation.' The most significant aspect of last year's events is that apparently this is still so : a Moroccan nation may be born, but not a Berber one. Some Berbers have made common cause with Moroccan—i.e. Arab-nationalism, despite the fact that in the long run this will mean their absorption in the Arab sea and the extinction of their culture.

It is not generally realised that Moroccan nationalism in its modern form was triggered off not by an act of French oppression but in protest against *lack* of oppression : an Arab protest against French lenience with Berber tribes, whose conquest was only being completed in the thirties. The French were responsible for the promulgation of the famous *dahir* (edict) *Berbère*. Indignation at this measure canalised vague discontent amongst the Arab intellectuals, and formed the first nationalist groups.

They might, at the time, have claimed to be protesting against certain encroachments by French law in a land that has its Islamic institutions guaranteed, or against alleged intentions to Christianise the Berbers ; but neither of these things ever really mattered. What in effect happened was that the French facilitated and aided the survival of tribal institutions—even if not orthodox from an Islamic point of view—and refused *their* pacification of the Berber tribes to be used for the benefit of the would-be theocratic *sherifian makhzen* (that is, government by sherifs, by a dynasty descended from the Prophet), which had never been able to subdue them with its own forces. And just this aroused nascent Arab-Moroccan nationalism, which came to seek its slogans and mystique in Islam, as elsewhere nations seeking to escape inferiority and powerlessness found theirs in Pan-slavism or Communism.

The French motive at the time may have been nothing more Machiavellian than the wish to facilitate an arduous

war against the mountain tribes—fighting in the Atlas ended only in 1933—and an admiration for tribal traditions, which to European eyes are markedly superior to Koranic law : not so much in content as in manner of administration and their secular, sensible, and elastic nature. The use of assemblies and of a known and common-sensical code seems superior to the orthodox Islamic practice, which allows one man to judge by an abstruse and sacred law unknown to the illiterate tribesman. Berber customary law protects the clan rather than abstract justice, but it minimises the possibility of corruption or tyranny. Koranic justice offers opportunities for both—and they do not remain unexploited.

Yet some of these tribesmen, who in the past have successfully resisted Arab encroachments and who often surrendered to the French only on condition that their institutions be preserved, seem to-day to be swinging over to a nationalism which, if it succeeds, will obliterate their culture. This is the most important and also, sociologically, the most curious development of the past two years. It looks as if the *politique Berbère* may fail.

M. François Lacoste, the Resident-General at the time I arrived in Morocco, assured me that there was no *politique Berbère*. He was surely sincere ; and in the sense of a deliberately planned fostering and utilisation of Berber separatism, there may never have been such a thing. Nevertheless, intended or not, a *politique Berbère* did take place. In the nature of things, it was bound to. Or, rather, a number of *politiques Berbères*, for that term is used to cover at least three different—sometimes incompatible—tendencies.

It means firstly the alliance with and use of the ' big chiefs of the South,' of whom the Glawi survived longest. These chiefs—or their recent predecessors—had usurped power within their own tribes, destroying the traditional democratic institutions, and as allies of the French extended their domains. They became, in effect, lords of the marches of the central government ; they ' pacified ' on its behalf, and what they pacified they kept. A long series of crises—the First World War, the Rif War, the painful conquest of central Morocco, the Second World War, and finally the emergence of militant nationalism made the use of the great chiefs inevitable ; to have a strong friendly

power keeping the South quiet was always a godsend to the French. Nevertheless, even from this utilitarian viewpoint, the big chiefs were sometimes a mixed blessing. The pacification of the central High Atlas might have gone more easily had the tribes not feared the native allies of the French, and recently the tasks of the Resident-General were complicated more by his friends than by his enemies.

Secondly, *la politique Berbère* can mean the very opposite from the tactical alliance with the big chiefs and the toleration of their tyranny; it means the support, in other Berber regions, of traditional tribal institutions which the big chiefs had replaced in their own tribes. (In the domains of the big chiefs, Berber customary law has been abrogated and replaced in theory, and theory only, by Koranic law.) It was incorrect to call the Glawi the 'Chief of the Berbers'; more than half the Berber tribes have retained their old institutions, with power sufficiently fragmented to obviate real tyranny—sometimes so much so that there are no chiefs above village level, and who change annually.

Within the larger Berber region where the old tribal republics survive—in more or less pure form—the French administration is often faced with a dilemma, a replica at tribal scale of what generally faces underdeveloped nations as wholes: whether to support democracy—verging on anarchy and ineffectual—or whether to 'push' a strong chief who will get things done, be easy to deal with, and may butter his own bread on the side. Republican sentiment, and the hope of leading Berbers directly from tribalism to modern local government without the intermediate stage of the caids, may incline the administrator one way. Temperament, administrative facility, or the desire to promote effectively local material improvements may lead him to the other. The greatest of Berber scholars, Robert Montagne, maintained that Berber society fluctuated between tribal democracy and occasional impermanent tyrannies. The process has continued under French rule; only the court of appeal in this struggle has become not the gun but the administration. No general policy seems to prevail, and the solution adopted varies with local conditions. If anything, there is a bias towards strong chiefdom, but not to the point of imposing it against manifest local feeling.

This dilemma, it must be noted, only arose in the non-Glawi regions. In the mountain domains of the Glawi

French influence was negligible and Glawa rule direct, unhampered by advice of the 'protecting power,' and strong without being progressive. (It is somewhat different where the Glawa domain overflows into the lowlands.)

In the non-Glawa regions of the Atlas, the French administration is genuinely present, and it is good. Of course, it cannot escape the defect of being alien. Let it be added that its indirect rule is indirect *rule*; the theory that the French administrator is merely an advisor of the local chief is a legal fiction. This may approach *administration directe*, but it is not clear that this is a bad thing.

There are various reasons that this administration should be good. The officers of the *Affaires Indigènes* are an élite body (the majority of present French generals are said to have passed through their ranks) often visibly deriving a kind of aesthetic pleasure from doing their task well, their region being isolated, self-contained, and fairly immune from external interference. A Captain in the Atlas compared to me his position *vis-à-vis* the Residence to that of an independent Berber chieftain *vis-à-vis* the Sultan before the pacification, when the Sultans ruled at best a bare half of the country, the remainder being *siba*, i.e. in a kind of permanent, institutionalised rebellion. He was exaggerating, but he had a point. Another factor, perhaps the main one, is that there is no objective conflict of interest between these tribesmen and the French. There being virtually no European settlers in most of the Berber tribal areas, the administrator faces no painful choices between justice and kinship. (Berbers may grumble at taxes, but less so than M. Poujade.) And finally there is the curious emotional relationship that often exists between European and Berbers.

This is perhaps the third sense of *politique Berbère*. It is an emotional matter, but important for all that. Berbers are not exactly Noble Savages, but in this sadly imperfect world they come near enough to it to enable well-wishers to romanticise them. Berber tribesmen in Morocco occupy, in European minds, something of the rôle Bedu Arabs do in the Middle East, with the difference that whereas Bedu military importance may be a myth, Berbers really have in the recent past played an impressive part in a number of wars: the Rif war, the pacification of the Atlas, the Spanish civil war, and the Mediterranean campaigns after 1942.

They have fought effectively both with European leadership and in tribal formations. The war of pacification is remembered affectionately by the French as a kind of manly, forthright affair. One almost expects to be told that after the fight both sides met in the showerbath, but for the fact that the Atlas Berbers do not wash a great deal. When General de la Tour last year visited certain Middle Atlas chieftains he said that he had known these men since the days when they used to take shots at him, and that 'nothing had changed.' He did *not* mean that they were again taking shots at him; he meant that the friendly relationship dating back to the original fighting was maintained, nationalism notwithstanding.

The situation is paradoxical. Whilst most Europeans value Berbers above Arabs, yet being an Arab is better than being a Berber, not merely in Arab eyes but equally in Berber estimation. Urbanised or educated Berbers generally want to become Arabised. This is merely the modern version of the old practice of Berber tribes of inventing for themselves an Arabic genealogy. Berbers look up to Arabs because their language is that of the revealed word of God, because it is written—Berber has no alphabet, let alone a written literature—and because they are a nation within which one can 'be somebody,' say a possessor of a professional skill; for the Berbers themselves are essentially a nation of mountain shepherds. This may make them fine troops and give them a romantic aura for Europeans, but it lacks appeal for themselves when they come to have a choice.

In as far as Berbers have swung over to Moroccan-Arab nationalism the causes of this seem to me to lie as much in the successes and achievements of the French administration as in any failures. In Morocco's past, Berbers had resisted the Sultans because government and order would have meant oppression; anarchy meant relative freedom and prosperity. The very fact that the French pacified without expropriating or oppressing enabled Berber tribesmen to become more loyal Muslims without going against their own material interests. To this must be added the improvement in sheer material means of communication and security reducing the isolation of mountain and oasis communities.

Secondly, in committing the error of allowing the deposition of Ben Yussif, the French had made the nationa-

lists a magnificent gift of a clearly intelligible and rousing symbol. Round this what survives of traditional xenophobia, of religious reverence for the sultan (which for Berbers had co-existed with political hostility to him in the past), has combined with such grievances as there are to form the unforeseen swing in the deposed Sultan's favour. These grievances are, I suspect, moral and economic rather than concerned with how Morocco is administered. (The oft-deplored *administration directe* in Berber regions, other than those of the late Glawi, is in practice a check against the indigenous tyranny and a stimulus to development.) Poverty, which is a by-product of population growth and of Morocco's rapid industrial revolution, is often seen by Moroccans mainly in terms of unfair differences between their and Europeans' wages (which indeed exist). Morally they resent the implicit and sometimes overt humiliations they receive, not at the hands of the administration, but of the large European population in the towns. These factors, of course, operate almost exclusively in the plain, near the centres of the two new proletariats, European and native; many Berbers, however, are seasonal or temporary migrants there. But discontent does, indeed, in general vary inversely with distance from the towns.

This contention may throw little light on the present fighting in the Rif. Reports that come from that region strongly suggest the interpretation that two things are superimposed on each other there: rebel groups organised and equipped from across the zonal frontier, plus a local *siba*—dissidence. It must be repeated that to Berber minds this is not an extreme, marginal and pejorative concept—as 'anarchy' or 'revolution' may be to Europeans, something to be avoided if possible. On the contrary, it is a commonplace and obvious alternative, a form of government (if one can say this without contradiction), and by no means necessarily the worst. Only a little over two or three decades—according to region—have passed since the old *siba*. The official French theory of the exile of the Sultan in '53 was that its ghost was abroad, and that it required his disposition to be laid. That particular *siba* turned out to be an illusion, but it would be a fine case of historical irony if the phoney spectre of '53, turning against those who had used its name in vain, became the genuine terror of '56.

ERNEST GELLNER.

Art. 8.—EVELYN'S DIARIES.

1. *The Diary of John Evelyn, now first printed in full from the manuscripts belonging to Mr John Evelyn, and edited by E. S. de Beer.* In six volumes. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1955. 15l. 15s.
2. *John Evelyn and his Family Circle.* By W. G. Hiscock. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1955. 25s. net.
3. *John Evelyn and Mrs Godolphin.* By W. G. Hiscock. Macmillan, 1952. 20s.
4. *John Evelyn: The Life of Mrs Margaret Godolphin.* Edited by (Miss) H. Sampson. Oxford University Press, 1939.

And other works.

SINCE their first partial and selective publication by Bray early in the nineteenth century, the great mass of Evelyn's diaries, and difficulty of access to the manuscripts, long proved insuperable obstacles to a full edition. But when, some twenty-five years ago, Mr Evelyn deposited them in the Bodleian Library for the purpose, the vast labour became possible.

There was fortunately available perhaps the only living scholar who could undertake it. The result is the *pièce de résistance* of the works before us. Mr de Beer is to be congratulated on the completion, after over twenty years' work, of this magnificent publication, which does high honour to English scholarship and also printing, the more refreshing since we have been becoming used to finding that all massive works of scholarship come from America, where scholars apparently have more time and more assistance at their disposal than have their English colleagues.

Special praise is due to the huge index, filling nearly the whole of the sixth volume, in which the mass is logically and clearly digested. It is high praise indeed, but well deserved, to say, as we can with truth, that it is in the same class as those to Boswell and Johnson by Dr L. F. Powell and Dr R. W. Chapman; all three are products of Oxford.

This great edition of the 'Diary' is accompanied by a smaller book of high value. Christ Church Library is now the home of a very large collection of the correspondence

of Evelyn and his family and friends—though when Bray saw the MS. of the 'Diary,' the Mrs Evelyn of the day told him that baskets of letters were used in the house for lighting fires, and this may well explain the absence, noticed as significant, of replies, especially from Godolphin, to surviving letters of Evelyn's. This great collection of letters of the whole family and circle is admirably selected and used by Mr W. G. Hiscock, of the Christ Church Library. The book (and in a lesser degree the same author's work on Evelyn and Margaret Blagge) is a real help to the use of the 'Diary.'

It has a fault, however, and an odd one. That is, that, in spite of its laudatory conclusion (quoted from Pepys, who was writing of what he knew), the author has a vehement contempt for Evelyn's character, and whenever possible, and often when impossible, sneeringly attributes base motives to him. There are, alas, a few occasions when he carries more conviction than pleasure.

'Pen and ink have ever amused me,' was Boswell's confession in one of his diaries. John Evelyn could have confessed the same. Beginning when still all but a boy with notes in the margins of printed calendars, written up later, he developed the habit throughout the rest of his long life, writing up his original notes, and, as time went on and occasion suggested, extending his narrative, for such public episodes as the Plague and the Fire of London, and for private events such as being robbed and left bound in a roadside wood on the way to London. And as years went on he recorded more fully the texts and the gist of the sermons he heard, though when, as sometimes occurred under the Commonwealth, the pulpit was occupied by some quite unqualified intruder, he disdained to record the sermon. It will probably not be the general view, but we believe that in the hands of a theologian who is also expert on the period, these notes of sermons might yield very instructive results. The same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of his entries concerning his private secular interests, such as estate management and the arts. But he is not profuse on these subjects, since he dealt with them in his published works. Public affairs, in which he was rarely far from the centre of events, though also rarely playing a major part, figure constantly in his record, and have been the most studied parts of his 'Diary.'

Of his many writings much of the best known, till the *Diary* appeared early in the nineteenth century, were, therefore, his books on forestry, gardening and allied subjects, notably his '*Sylva*,' to which the '*Pomona*' and the rest were appended, so that he came to be spoken of in the family as '*old Sylva*.' But his intellectual interests were wide and genuine. Architecture stood high among them; and he both collected, studied and published an account of engravings, deriving, incidentally, his account of the then new art of mezzotinting, and the magnificent plate, '*The Executioner*,' from Prince Rupert, who had brought it into England. He was also responsible for the gift by Howard of the Arundel Marbles to Oxford, and of the Arundel Library between the Royal Society and the College of Arms. (He had Howard for a neighbour at Albury, where he designed the gardens.) The want of a public library in London troubled his mind, and he made suggestions towards one; but though he knew Sloane, who attended his wife, and who was Secretary of the Royal Society, the British Museum had yet to wait half a century to be founded.

We call him '*Evelyn of Wotton*.' It was his birth-place, and after his brother George's death, only a few years before his own, it became at last his property and regular home; he had indeed been in close touch with his brother and taken a hand in the estate management, and especially in the forestry of that deeply wooded tract of land. His influence on forestry spread wide. We believe that it was he who naturalised the Scotch fir in the South of England; that tree ran riot all over the sands of Surrey and Sussex, leaving the clay bottoms to the indigenous '*Sussex weed*,' the oak. Landowners of the next century, such as Gibbon's friend, the first Lord Sheffield, planted clumps of Scotch fir along the roadside '*waste of the manor*.'

In his own time he was thought of less as of Wotton than as of Sayes Court, Deptford. This house, with its grounds—both it would seem in rather derelict state—belonged to his wife's father, Sir Richard Browne, the Royalist representative in Paris. On his return from the Continent and marriage with the young Mary Browne, it was natural that Evelyn should settle there and attend to the neglected house and ground. He dealt with the latter at least to

excellent effect, turning a wilderness into a 'boscaresque' garden both for pleasure and profit of fruit. Here it was that he practised what he preached in 'Sylva,' 'Pomona,' and the other books he wrote for gardeners. 'He lives,' Mrs Evelyn complained, 'most part of the night in his hole'; but he begat several children for all that. His 'hole', Mr Hiscock observes, looked onto the pigstyes, manure heaps and privies. But a true gardener enjoys manure in any form.

Here, too, he found an excellent base of operations for his public work, now that the King and Court were again at Whitehall. He never held any very important permanent office in the Crown service, but was constantly employed in more occasional work, particularly during the Dutch war, largely for the Admiralty. He had a hand in the foundations of both Greenwich and Chelsea Hospitals.

He had already met the Clerk of the Admiralty Acts, Samuel Pepys, since both were original members of the Royal Society, both served the Admiralty, and, as they came to know each other well, both must have been delighted to find common ground in collecting books and prints, and in a wide and vivacious intellectual curiosity.

Evelyn may be thought to have been, and indeed probably was, the less lively of the two; but in a diary meant at least to be open to family reading he could not afford to make the confessions of private lapses from virtue or mere decorum that were possible in shorthand. There is evidence that in the right company, and especially in that of Pepys, he could be a lively companion, and even capable on occasions of drinking too much, in fact far from priggish sobriety. Not only were the two men made for each other; more than a century after their deaths their two Diaries were first published, within a very few years, if only in selections. Yet it is probable that neither knew of the existence of the other's. Pepys's, it is true, was carried on for no more than ten years. Between them they left for posterity eyewitness descriptions of many events, such as the Plague and the Fire, of which without them we should have no such clear picture. The friendship of this pair, with their rich common fund of interests and loyalties, is one of history's happiest accidents.

For all his out-of-door activities of duty or hobby, and for all his nightly occupation with pen and ink, Evelyn was

an excellent husband, father, and family man in general. The fortunes of the whole clan can be followed in the Diary. Mrs Evelyn was little more than a child at the time of her marriage; her husband, *more suo*, wrote and had handsomely bound for her a volume of instructions in the *arcana* of the married state. This, if indeed it survives, is naturally not included in the published Diaries. But neither are Evelyn's other and less personal writings. As she grew older and developed, Mary Evelyn became not only an excellent wife, mother, and housekeeper, but, to judge from her surviving letters, something of a wit. Mr Hiscock prints extracts from her lively correspondence with William Glanville.

Evelyn may often be thought the less of for not having played an active part in the Civil War. His contribution was confined to the gift of a horse to the King's service. But he had found himself unsuited to the life of camps, and his horse was doubtless more useful than he himself would have been. Moreover, he lived in a district which was strongly Parliamentarian, and by joining the Royalist Army he would only have caused the family estates to be sequestered, so he did well to go abroad during the worst of the troubles. On all this Mr de Beer's short biography, to be found in his first volume, gives a lucid and convincing account.

The passion which could and did strike sparks out of Evelyn's rather quiet and unadventurous heart was his loyalty to the Church of England, the loyalty for which Charles I had sacrificed his life, and which Evelyn and his friends saw on all hands endangered and betrayed, both by Presbyterians and sectaries on the one hand and by Roman Catholics on the other. On Christmas Day of 1657, with the rest of the congregation at Exeter House Chapel in the Strand, he was surrounded and threatened by soldiers with drawn swords, and in that position received the Sacrament; for the celebration of Christmas Day had been specifically forbidden by law. The official motive behind this piece of official bigotry seems to have been double, theological and political, since anti-Parliamentary intrigue was feared, perhaps not altogether without reason; but the commanding officers of the troops were so foolish as to attack their prisoners with theological weapons. No one seems to have been punished, though the law (whatever we may think of

its sanity) was definite and was being openly contravened. Hudibras, we may remember,

' would disparage

His best and dearest friend, plum porridge ' ;

and it was this kind of thing which created the great national sigh of relief at the Restoration—in the promotion of which event Evelyn displayed a good deal of activity.

That Evelyn was not a strong partisan in secular politics—if any politics of his time were really secular—may be inferred from his friendship with Thomas Tenison, Vicar of St Martin-in-the-Fields, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, who was always a Whig. Probably he would have agreed with Johnson, who gave it as his opinion that a wise Whig and a wise Tory would generally be found to agree. But James II's lawless campaign to replace Anglicans by Roman Catholics was odious to him, and he evaded so far as he could being made an official party to it. Ten years before those troubles, well back in the reign of Charles II, he had an experience which has a bearing on this, and to which it is impossible not to devote some attention.

Evelyn's churchmanship and intense piety played a large part in what has been increasingly the most discussed phase of his life, his friendship with Margaret Blagge, afterwards Mrs Sidney Godolphin, which he himself recorded after her early death, though of course only in private MS. form, and which, since its first publication in 1847, has bulked large—perhaps relatively too large—in estimates of its author.

Margaret was the orphan daughter of a Royalist colonel, and at seventeen, when Evelyn first noticed her at Whitehall, was a maid-of-honour to the Duchess of York ; at twenty, she had been transferred to the service of the Queen, and then Evelyn began to see more of her, and still more when she retired and lived with Lord and Lady Berkeley. She was a charming girl, pretty and clever and, above all, intensely devout and good ; indeed, had she lived in another age, she might well have taken the veil. As Mr de Beer truly says, ' There was a place to be created and held in his affections by the right person ; his own daughters were too young to provide the companionship which a father of fifty years of age very often obtains from a daughter just approaching womanhood.' Margaret was

in fact, and had long been, engaged to Sidney Godolphin, a rising young statesman, later to hold high office; this was additional safety. The pair met very often, read and prayed together or prosecuted her charities, while Evelyn took charge of Margaret's business affairs, since she had some substantial property of her own. She was also *persona grata* to Mrs Evelyn, and when she went to Paris with Lord and Lady Berkeley, she was persuaded to take charge of the Evelyns' son.

By this time she was already secretly married to Godolphin, but the pair did not at once set up housekeeping together. Innocent and natural as his love for her was, the discovery, and especially the secrecy, on the top of their intimacy, must have come as a shock to Evelyn; we can infer as much, not only from our knowledge of the heart, but from the fact that no word of his, written at the moment of discovery, survives, or perhaps was ever put on paper. No doubt Godolphin had bound her to silence. A motive for a secret marriage, unless it were Evelyn, is hard to see.

The friendship of the pair, or now rather of the trio, did not end there. Evelyn continued to see the young couple, and to look after their affairs. But the intimate religious meetings faded out. After two years of marriage, Margaret bore a son, but died very agonisingly, of puerperal fever. Godolphin was prostrated by grief, and Evelyn, himself hardly less so, had all arrangements to make. The young widower, thus left with a motherless baby son, had his life to live. It was a long one, and distinguished by high office; but he never married again.

Evelyn solaced his grief by writing his well-known 'Life' of Margaret, in which he told in full the story of the pious and (on his side at least) half-passionate friendship. That he was, though without any danger of evil, in love with her cannot be doubted; nor will any large-minded man or woman think the worse of him for that, nor more than a very little the worse that, as Mr Hiscock, in pointing out some inconsistencies in Evelyn's account, truly sums up, 'he had lost her in life; in death he tried to recapture her.'

The 'Life' was published in 1847, when the Tractarian movement was in its early freshness. Evelyn's account of Margaret's, and of his own, passionate Anglican piety

naturally appealed to that generation. There have since then appeared a number of other editions, and also of comments. They are marked by an increasing tendency to cynicism, though Miss Sampson's, of 1939, is held the best of all. The difference between the heart of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries could hardly be better indicated ; as Pepys would have said, ' it is pretty to see.'

Margaret was but a brief episode in her friend's eighty years of busy living. But nothing else in them brings him so close to us across nearly three centuries.

ARUNDELL ESDAILE.

Art. 9.—THE SPAN OF A HISTORY.

THE invention of printing was welcomed by the Spanish historian Diego de Valera for its assistance to historical knowledge. On the last page of his '*Crónica abreviada de España*,' printed at Seville in 1482, he alluded to his difficulties in procuring the manuscripts for the documentation of his chronicle and spoke of the succour afforded by the German experts in the divine art of printing, who were securing by the multiplication of codices the knowledge of past, present, and future so far as human ingenuity could provide. To-day, however, the historian finds himself like a sorcerer's apprentice, in some embarrassment at the unremitting multiplication of documents. According to Sir Maurice Powicke ('*Modern Historians and the Study of History*,' p. 202) the range of history which any person can hope to compass has been narrowing so much that it is doubtful nowadays whether anyone dealing with any period of European history or world history since the eleventh century could write a really great book covering more than fifty years, or, if he attempted a complete history of one country or one important aspect of social life, more than a century. By a 'complete history' Sir Maurice explains that he means a history in the Gibbonian sense, based upon the available material, original, secondary, and critical.

This narrowing of range for a real scholar may appear unavoidable, for since the days of Leonardo da Vinci the vast extension of knowledge has led to increasing specialisation not only between various studies but also within a study. It is in limitation, as Goethe remarked, that a man first shows himself a master, and the historian perhaps ought not to fret at being tethered to a range of fifty years, which covers a couple of generations and therefore offers the likelihood of some variety and contrast. In any case he is allowed greater liberty than under the restrictions proposed in the fifteenth century by Bishop Lope de Barrientos, who in the introduction to his chronicle of the reign of King Juan II of Castile (an adaptation of one by the Chief Falconer, with more attention to political manœuvres and less to the details of tournaments) laid down three requirements for a veracious history: (1) the historian must be wise and discreet, and able to write in an elevated style; (2) he must have been present at the important events

narrated or at least obtained his information from trustworthy witnesses ; and (3) he must not publish his history in the lifetime of those whose actions he records, to avoid having to flatter the mighty or getting his history altered by them ('*Refundición de la crónica del Halconero*,' ed. J. de M. Carriazo, pp. 5-7). There is, however, no assurance that the maximum period of fifty years will not be progressively reduced both by the indefatigable unearthing of new items of information and also by a titanic piling of commentary on commentary. It is therefore time to consider whether, after all, Gibbon's erudition rather than his range ought to be taken as a model.

Granted that only a work written on Gibbon's scale of detail is a complete history, in other words an adequate reconstruction of the past, and that no work written on that scale can nowadays cover more than fifty years or a century, as the case may be, then any work covering more than fifty years or a century is bound to be somewhat inadequate, and a work on world history is bound to fall so far short of the ideal of history as to be scarcely worthy of the name. Sir Maurice Powicke admits that suggestive and even important works on world history are within the capacity of some rare people, but, though qualifying as debatable and arid the question whether such books should be regarded as history, he expresses a preference for calling them essays about history. Yet although Sir Maurice's testimony on the possible range of a work on the Gibbonian scale is hardly open to challenge, it may still be questioned whether he is right in taking this scale as the ideal. Is this scale indispensable to an adequate reconstruction of the past ? If an adequate reconstruction involved regaling the reader with every scrap of information on the theme proposed, then a genuine history would be possible only of some isolated incident such as the Battle of Tewkesbury or of some ancient and obscure people such as the Tartessians. In general, however, a historian does not attempt to set forth all the available evidence, but selects what he thinks important. Now what is important varies with the range—just as what is prominent to an observer who can see the whole elevation of a cathedral differs from what is prominent to one who is so close that he can see only a part of it. If a historian doubles his range, he does not say only half as much about everything which he mentioned in the

shorter period, unless he is a pure epitomator, but he selects as important only some of the things which were important in the shorter period. It would, for example, be an error to omit Bion the Borysthenite from a history of Greek Cynicism, but Bion could quite well be ignored in a history of Greek philosophy from Thales to Proclus. The point is put forcefully by Harnack in the Preface to the First Edition of his 'History of Dogma,' where he says that the book does not provide a repertory of the theological thought of Christian antiquity. A selection, he declares, was necessary not only owing to the great diversity of Christian ideas or of ideas closely related to Christianity but also owing to the aim of the work, because 'the history of dogma has to give an account only of those doctrines of Christian writers which were authoritative in wide circles, or which furthered the advance of the development; otherwise it would become a collection of monographs, and thereby lose its proper value' (Eng. tr., p. ix). Similarly with critical material, even on controversial points. An article devoted to the Battle of Brunanburh could hardly ignore many of the wayward locations suggested of the site, but a history of the Anglo-Saxons might very well locate the battle without more ado at Bromborough, and refer the reader for other suggestions to a critical edition of the Anglo-Saxon poem on the battle.

In short, the scale of detail not only does but should vary with the range. Hence it does not follow that because a work covering more than fifty years cannot be written on the same scale as one covering only fifty years or under, it is any the less a genuine history.

For all that, it might still seem advisable for a historian to content himself with a short range where there is a glut of information, especially as the present university structure makes it hard for a man to find others to undertake the humble task of devilling for him—collaboration among historians is usually an alliance of peers, each of whom contributes his own section to the work and, whatever hints he may be willing to accept from the editor, does not expect his contribution to be worked up by someone else. To decide whether such voluntary narrowing of range is harmless, it is necessary to consider first why the historian needs any range at all. The reason is that history is a sphere of coming to be and passing away. It is now accepted as a

principle of natural science that there is no nature at an instant, that it takes time for things to exist (A. N. Whitehead, 'Modes of Thought,' p. 200). It is even more plain that there is no historical reality at an instant; not only do battles and conspiracies take time, but also social and economic usages and institutions, even religious and philosophical ideas, have their entrances and exits on the stage of human life. Hence historiography is essentially narrative (which by no means precludes preliminary studies) because narration is exposition of a process. Only a narrative of a foot-race, for example, can say what actually happened in the race. A photograph or description of an instant in it will show perhaps one runner in front of another, but it will not say whether the runner behind is catching up, falling behind, or keeping the same distance. The span of a complete narrative depends on the length of the process or tissue of processes in point. A part of a process is an abstraction, which is misconceived if treated as something concrete. To understand an abstraction as something abstract involves a comprehension of the whole, of which it forms part. While, therefore, a historian need not narrate the whole of a process, yet unless he comprehends the whole and reveals the whole as inherent in the fragment that he does narrate, he is failing to say what actually happened. If, however, he does comprehend the whole, then it is open to him to narrate it. Hence the span of a history ought not to rest on the paucity or amplitude of available information.

To justify the historian's confining his knowledge to a period of fifty years if he tackles European history since the eleventh century, no historical processes since then must have lasted longer than fifty years. Yet movements of thought are patently liable to last longer—otherwise we should have long ago seen the back of Marxism, not to mention Christianity. It may be objected that medieval Catholicism was so far removed from primitive Christianity that the student of, say, the first half of the fifteenth century can safely ignore primitive Christianity. Without doubt it was a far cry from the New Testament when at the fiestas of Valladolid in 1428 King Juan II could appear armed for jousting in the guise of God the Father, while twelve of his knights represented the Twelve Apostles, with diadems on their heads and scrolls in the hands indicating what manner of martyrdom they had suffered (Barrientos, *op. cit.*, p. 63 sq.).

The redoubtable Pero Niño represented St Paul, who did not count in the early Church as one of the Twelve, and he broke more lances than anyone else ('El Victorial,' ed. J. de M. Carriazo, p. 329). Nevertheless, the continuity with early Christianity was not so disrupted that men did not still call themselves Christians and even prescribe special rules for warfare against fellow Christians, such as those observed by Pero Niño, save by way of reprisal, in his raid on the English coast in 1405 ('El Victorial,' p. 215). The historian cannot tell what was going on unless he decides how far men were right to regard themselves as Christians, and of course the thought that the Roman Church had degenerated was the stimulus of the Council of Constance (1415-18), which set itself to the task of root and branch reform, and of other endeavours culminating in the Protestant Reformation. The historian cannot confine his knowledge to the first half of the fifteenth century without failing to comprehend a process beginning fourteen hundred years before and shortly to have notable developments.

If, then, a historian is liable to find himself willy-nilly bestriding millennia, where can a line be drawn? Can any units be detached as self-complete processes? Gibbon's example suggests taking empires as such units, but empires are political entities and therefore superficial and not self-subsistent. Spengler and Dr Toynbee have marked off various cultures or civilisations, and these certainly belong to a deeper stratum than empires. Yet historical reality is the cockpit in which men of different civilisations contend with each other and even learn from each other. In the late Roman Empire the Gallo-Romans were not simply subjugated by Germanic tribes but adopted their ideals, so that they lost something of the mild culture of their ancestors and became more ready for adventure, more fierce and daring (S. Dill: 'Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age,' p. 274). Or consider the case of natural science. It became a distinct study only in the sixteenth century with the resolute rejection of magic and the application of mathematics to the study of nature, but nevertheless Schroedinger to-day considers that so much of the fundamental ideas of natural science have been taken over from the Greeks as to warrant an assiduous examination of Greek thought in the hope not only of finding buried wisdom but also of detecting error at the source ('Nature

and the Greeks,' p. 16). Thus even in natural science, let alone mathematics and philosophy, our modern ideas are not independent of Greek culture, and the historian of modern natural science will have to examine Greek conceptions to ascertain the correctness of Schroedinger's studies.

Even cultures or civilisations, therefore, are not windowless and impermeable units which can be absolutely detached for historical study. There is nothing for it but to admit that the sole concrete historical process is the history of the world, and that all other historical processes are fully comprehended only when seen in the light of the history of the world. History is accordingly an exacting study whose demands are not satisfied by the expedient of confining oneself to a short period. Not but what the writing of a world history, which involves selecting what is important in the course of the world, requires insight and discernment belonging to none but a few rare spirits.

A. MACC. ARMSTRONG.

Art. 10.—AFGHANISTAN AND RUSSIA.

AFGHANISTAN occupies a position of the utmost importance from a strategical point of view, lying as she does between the U.S.S.R. and the North-West Province of Pakistan. She thus forms a buffer state between her two neighbours. Her northern boundary runs along the River Oxus and her southern border follows the Durand Line through the wild hills of the Pathan tribes. Her attitude towards both Russia and Pakistan is one of strict neutrality and she is anxious to remain on friendly terms with them both. The northern region of Afghanistan consists of a vast plain reaching to the foot of ranges of rugged hills where rough roads and tracks struggle through mountain passes varying from 14,000 to 18,000 feet above sea-level. Owing to heavy falls of snow, these passes are practicable for traffic only in the summer months. Attempts have been made to construct a motor road circling the hills in an easterly direction, but it is unlikely that this road would stand up to heavy motor traffic. It is probable that it will be completed by Russian experts now engaged in road construction in the neighbourhood of Kabul. The Oxus, over a mile wide, is closely watched on the Russian shore and forms a natural barrier to invasion. The sole means of crossing are by the heavy barges, which carry animals as well as passengers.

Afghanistan is rich in natural resources and only needs scientific development to become a wealthy country. Coal, silver, copper, lead, and iron exist in workable quantities. The Afghan Government are making great strides towards the economic development of the country through Government-controlled monopolies such as the National Bank and dealings in karakul, sugar, cotton, electrical generation, and other industries. Russian industrialists are developing sugar refineries, bakeries, and the construction of roads which can only be designed for strategic purposes. There are no railways in the country, although three lines of rails have been planned. No work, however, has as yet been commenced. Education is free both for elementary and secondary schools, but Muslim prejudice is averse to Western education, especially for women. Afghanistan was admitted to the League of Nations in 1933 and to UNO in 1944.

RELATIONS WITH PAKISTAN

From time to time Afghanistan has advanced claims to the major portion of Pakistan as far east as the River Indus on the grounds that in former days the Afghan Empire reached as far east as Benares. These claims have naturally been repudiated by the Pakistan Government, but have received a certain amount of support from India to judge by the statements of certain Indian ministers and articles in the Indian press. Of late years, however, Afghanistan appears to have dropped her former claim to Pakistan territory. In 1947 the project for an independent State of 'Pukhtoonistan' was mooted by agitators in Afghanistan, who demanded the incorporation of the North-West Frontier Province and parts of Scinde and Baluchistan into Afghanistan. These claims were firmly refused by Britain. At a Jirgah held in 1947 the Pathan tribes decided to adhere to Pakistan. They deeply resented the interference of Afghanistan and stated that they were quite capable of managing their own affairs. The Afghan Government are fully aware of the menace of irruption on a large scale into the country by Pathan tribesmen in Pakistan, who are said to be preparing for a rush to gather the loot of Kabul. A few years ago when I was at Lundi Kotal I had lunch with the Malik of the Shinwaris, who told me that his people, as well as the Mohmunds, Afridis, and Mahsuds, were eagerly awaiting the signal for such an invasion. They considered that the ill-armed Afghan army would be incapable of arresting their advance. It is thus that the King of Afghanistan has summoned the Loe Jirgah, or Grand Council of Elders, to decide on the most suitable measures to be taken. It is considered that the Council may advise the Government to bring the matter to the notice of the Security Council. The Afghan army has been mobilised in view of the menace from Pakistan. Recent reports are to hand of an Afghan invasion of Pakistan by Afghan tribes from across the border. It appears that this 'invasion' was subsidised by India. The tribesmen duly accepted the subsidy and joyfully departed for their homes. It was not taken seriously by the Pakistan Government.

Afghanistan is not a member of the Baghdad Pact, with which, according to her *chargé d'affaires* at Karachi, she

has nothing to do. She is not for the moment seeking to join it or to reject it.

During the early months of 1955 relations with Pakistan became strained to a serious extent. The Pakistan Minister of the Interior, General Mirza, toured the frontier and on his return he stated that the Government hoped for close friendship with Afghanistan and close co-operation between the two countries, but the attitude of Afghanistan might force Pakistan to fight in self-defence. He appealed to the uncle of the king to 'stop this calamity' and added that Pakistan would fight to preserve the maintenance of the Durand Line, which he regarded as the national boundary between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The recent merger of the tribal areas on the Frontier into the new Province of West Pakistan, which includes the Khyber Pass, has been the cause of the sharpening of the relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan. Pakistan regards the matter as a purely domestic affair which concerns no one but herself. Kabul immediately protested and recalled her envoy from Karachi. Before he left for Kabul Mr Attik, the Afghan Envoy, made a speech in which he stated that Afghanistan now regarded the Anglo-Afghan Treaty of 1921 as having lapsed. This treaty confirmed the Durand Line, established in 1893, which now defines the boundary between Afghanistan and Pakistan. He stated that the Durand Line was an artificial boundary imposed by the British which the Afghans accepted because they had no other choice. The treaty, he added, was now void.

Kabul demanded that the Pushtu-speaking areas now in Pakistan should be allowed to decide their political future by a plebiscite, feeling assured that they would chose to join Afghanistan. This, however, is doubtful. From my own experience on the Frontier I should consider it extremely doubtful that they would fall in with the wishes of Kabul, which they regard as their natural enemy.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

The fear of invasion by Russia from across the Oxus is ever present with the Afghan Government, whose apprehension has been increased by the formation of a formidable Central Asian Military Operational Base in the Tashkent

region consisting of dépôts, airfields, and army training areas covering Bokhara, Samarkhand, and other regions. It is considered that this constitutes a direct threat against Afghanistan not only from a purely military point of view but also from the danger of civilian penetration and subversive operations. It is known that at Tashkent there is a school for foreign Communists where the technique of agitation, infiltration, sabotage, and subversion is taught. Day and night a powerful broadcasting station pours out inflammatory Communist propaganda to Asian countries clearly audible in Afghanistan. It causes deep resentment among the Afghans, who are fervent Muslims and have no use whatever for the teachings of Lenin, Marx, and Stalin. This staunch religious sentiment may act as a deterrent against Communism, but too much reliance should not be placed thereon in the face of propaganda skilfully wielded by agents trained in all the subtleties of Communism.

Further causes for Afghan anxiety *vis-à-vis* Russia are evoked by the presence of Russian agents as far south as Herat and Kandahar. When captured they were found to be in possession of large sums of money for the purpose of bribing high officials and frustrating the efforts of the loyal army to prevent invasion when the time arrives. They also carried plans for the formation of an Afghan Government of 'National Liberation' at Mazar-i-Sharif. These agents, it is stated, were 'disposed of' without publicity. One may hazard a guess at their fate.

At the time of writing, November 1955, negotiations are in progress between Afghanistan and Czechoslovakia for a supply of arms and equipment for Afghanistan. The nature of these arms is not stated, but it is probable that they will consist of small arms and possibly light field artillery. Although not up to date by modern Western standards, they would be formidable enough on the Pakistan frontier. An Afghan Military Mission is about to start for Prague to inspect them at the invitation of Czechoslovakia. If the terms are suitable and there are no conditions, Afghanistan would buy them. In this connection it is noticeable that the supply of surplus Communist arms is being carried out by Satellite States and not by Russia herself, although it is highly improbable that such transactions could be arranged without the approval of the Kremlin. The impending visit of Marshal Bulganin and M. Krushev to Afghanistan

after their visit to India lends credence to this belief. If a State likes to dispose of her military equipment, it is her own affair entirely. It is a matter of speculation as to how Czech equipment could be delivered at Kabul if the deal is carried through. It is highly unlikely that arms would be allowed transit through Pakistan or through any of the Baghdad Treaty countries. The alternatives seem to be to fly them direct from Prague, a distance of about 3,000 miles, or to send them through Russia. Either course would involve much additional expense and more delay.

Russia has recently made a loan of 200l. millions to Afghanistan, principally in goods and services. Russian engineers have now completed the reconnaissance of the pipe-line between Mazar-i-Sharif and Khalif and an alternative line between Mazar-i-Sharif and Termez on the frontier. Details of these lines are lacking, but it is known that Moscow has offered to provide the material.

Although America has supplied arms and equipment to Pakistan, to which Pundit Nehru of India has raised strong objections, the Americans as well as the British have refused to supply them to Afghanistan for fear of causing difficulties in Pakistan. The invasion of their country by the Russians is a very real fear among Government circles at Kabul, who regard the activities of the Russians, their loan to Afghanistan, the presence of their industrialists and technicians, together with their attempts at bribing officials, as the preliminary stages of the 'softening-up process' which in many cases elsewhere has preceded the actual occupation of a country. Against invasion Afghanistan would be powerless to offer adequate resistance. This may well be why the Russians are constructing roads near Kabul.

Afghanistan was deeply concerned over the signing of the Near Eastern Security Pact, which includes Pakistan, Iraq, Persia, and Turkey. It is believed that with the signing of this Pact Russia will strongly react *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan. Recent events in Russian territories lend strength to this belief, viz. persecution of Islam in the areas of the Soviet-Afghan frontier, closure of mosques, arrests and executions of Muslims, while streams of insults to Islam are poured out by day and night from radio stations in the Turkmen and Uzbek Republics. These broadcasts are plainly audible in Afghanistan and the Afghans are naturally deeply offended by them. Persecutions have

recently taken a more severe form in the arrest and execution of people in the service of Islam in Mukry, Takhta Bazaar, and Kalai Mor, all within easy reach of the Afghan border. News of these executions are spread rapidly by nomads.

There is no doubt that Russian interest in Afghanistan has increased considerably of late, attributed in Pakistan to the fact that she constitutes a substantial break in the defence line formed by the Baghdad Pact from the Danube to the Himalayas along the southern borders of U.S.S.R. Since the admission of Pakistan to the S.E.A.T.O. Afghan policy appears to have veered rather towards India, whose neutrality *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan is regarded as a stable factor. Afghan relations with New Delhi, both economic and political, are given a prominent place in Afghan policy. It is hoped that this will attract the interest of India and lead to a larger share in the industrialisation of the country. India, however, seems either unwilling or unable to accede to Afghanistan's desires in this direction.

The interest displayed by Russia in Afghanistan is scarcely likely to be purely for the benefit of that country or devoid of ulterior motives in which Russia herself is directly concerned. Road construction near Kabul points to troop movements, while food industries suggests their supplies. The 500-600 technicians and advisers now in Afghanistan directing Russian enterprise are profitable sources of Communist propaganda and in the event of Russian penetration into Afghanistan would be available for well-organised fifth-column activities.

As in Tibet, Russian occupation of Afghanistan would lead to the occupation of the passes into Pakistan, where the Khyber Pass gives direct access into the North-West Province. The threat to Afghanistan by the frontier tribes and the supply of arms to Pakistan by America would provide sufficient reason for this move, which Pakistan would inevitably regard as a direct threat against herself. Russian aggression against the North-West Frontier, for many years the nightmare of British rulers in India, would become a reality for the Pakistan Government. Were this threat to become a reality, would British troops be despatched to the aid of Pakistan, a member of the Commonwealth? Although Russian Ministers declaim on all occasions their fervent desire for peace, Russia has none

the less shown herself an adept at inducing her satellites to pull the chestnut out of the fire for her, as the world saw in Korea and Indo-China. The ceding of the Padak Corridor to the north of Kashmir to the U.S.S.R. affords an easy passage for Chinese 'volunteers' (who went to Korea with equal facility) to be despatched to the 'liberation' of Afghanistan from Western imperialists. Afghanistan has no intention of joining the Baghdad Pact and she now sees herself largely surrounded by its members. Persia and Iraq to the west and Pakistan to the south. Here, then, is a ready-made pretext for Russia to come to the support of the 'weaker brother.'

The 'liberation' of Tibet from the 'Western imperialists' was advanced by the Chinese as the pretext for their occupation of the country, not that they or anyone else believed that such a threat existed. A similar pretext could without difficulty be put forward for the occupation of Afghanistan, the signing of the Baghdad Pact taking the place of Western imperialists. A Chinese army advancing through the Padak Corridor would find roads constructed by the Russians in the neighbourhood of Kabul ready for their use, while the granaries and bakeries now under Russian supervision would supply the necessary rations. It is unlikely that the occupation of Afghanistan by the Communists would be limited to Kabul and its neighbourhood. As in Tibet, the invading forces would be pushed south and west to occupy the passes leading to Pakistan and the towns of Herat and Kandahar on the Persian frontier. The presence of Russian agents in these towns may possibly be explained by intelligent anticipation of future events. The former British cantonments of Quetta, Razmak, Bunnu, and Lundi Kotal would be occupied, although General Mirza, the Pakistan Minister, has stated that Pakistan forces would fight in the defence of the Durand Line. This line, as stated above, has been repudiated by the Afghan Government. Supported by Russian aircraft, Chinese troops could seize and occupy the frontier posts, although their supply would be a matter of some difficulty. It will be interesting to see if the roads now under construction are pushed down to the frontiers, as they were in Tibet.

H. E. CROCKER.

Art. 11.—REDRAWING THE POLITICAL MAP OF INDIA.

INDIA is a continent built up of many nations or countries differing in language and culture. With an area of about half a million square miles less than that of Europe (1,581,420 square miles as compared with 2,086,500), she has a population only a few millions less than Europe's four hundred and three millions. Her frontiers are everywhere mountainous, with the mighty Himalayas secluding her from the Asian land mass on the north. A mountain range, the Vindhya, running from east to west divides the country separating the Gangetic plain from the southern tableland of the peninsula.

At the dawn of history, two great ethnic groups shared the continent, the Indo-Aryans north of the Vindhya, and the Dravidians on the south. The latter claim to have held India before the Aryan invasion; the newcomers thrust them beyond the dividing mountains. There the Dravidians have held their own down the ages. From time to time empires have been built up in the North, beginning with that of Asoka in the fourth century B.C.; northern rulers never succeeded in appropriating the South, where rival kingdoms contended for empire for centuries; none succeeded in bringing the South under one rule. As time went on, Aryan Brahmins in the North had evolved Hinduism, a socio-religious system based on a rigid foundation of caste. A cultural invasion of the South by the Brahmins of the North during a millennium or more from the fourth or fifth century B.C. onwards carried Hinduism among the Dravidians as far as Cape Comorin.

In the eleventh century, Muslim hordes swept over the northern plains of India. The country at the time was split up into numerous small states, mostly at feud with each other; this and the sterilising effect of caste made a joint effort to oppose invasion impossible. The invaders established their rule firmly: it was not long before Muslim armies penetrated to the extreme South. The tendency to separatism between North and South, however, soon showed itself, and early in the fifteenth century Muslim rulers in the South fell away from the imperial North. The powerful Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar held the country south of the Kistnah against militant Islam till

1565, when the Muslims combined and smashed it to pieces in the famous battle of Talicottah. Thereafter, Muslim rulers held most of the South, directly or indirectly, till Maratha resurgence towards the close of the seventeenth century deprived them of most of their territories, leaving a remnant of Muslim rule in Hyderabad.

It was during this period that the British appear on the scene. After disposing of the French, who were endeavouring to establish themselves in South India, they allied themselves with Hyderabad and, with the aid of the Nizam, successfully challenged Maratha supremacy. In the next half-century they had brought under their control the whole of India from the Karakorams in north Kashmir to Cape Comorin in the South, an achievement accomplished for the first time in recorded history.

Throughout the troublous times following the Muslim invasions of the Deccan, the Dravidian peoples maintained their identity. There were no mass conversions and Hinduism held its own against dominant Islam. The Muslim population was mainly immigrant, from Arabia, Persia, and the Afghan borderland. The leading groups of Dravidians to-day are the Tamils, the Telegus or Andhras, the Kanarese, and, in the extreme south, between the Ghauts and the sea, the Malayalis, all speaking different languages. A fifth in the South, the Marathas, is, according to ethnographical theory, a blend of Dravidians and Scythian nomads who in remote ages invaded the Deccan through Kutch and the Kathiawad peninsula. A similar origin is ascribed to the Gujaratis, who settled in the north of Bombay, Kathiawar, and Baroda.

The Telegus, the Kanarese, the Tamils, and the Marathas occupy great blocks of territory in the peninsula : the Telegus or Andhras in the eastern tracts of the central Deccan between the Eastern Ghauts and the sea ; the Tamils have the South from the coast on the east to the Western Ghauts. In the Hyderabad State, three of the groups, the Telegus, Marathas, and Kanarese, hold great tracts of the country, the Marathas on the north-west, the Kanarese in the south, and the Telegus on the east. The Malayalis, as already noted, occupy the country between the Western Ghauts and the sea, comprising the Madras district of Malabar and the princely states of Travancore

and Cochin. The Kanarese have a long, irregular tract including Mysore, stretching from south Hyderabad to the sea on the west. The Marathas, apart from their holding in Hyderabad, have large areas in south Madhya Pradesh (formerly Central Provinces) and in Bombay. Most of the Gujaratis are settled north of the Vindhyas.

The brief historical sketch in the foregoing paragraphs emphasises the separatism down the ages between the North and the South; it is intended as an introduction to the subject of this article, the problem before the Indian Government of dealing with the claims of the leading people of the South, the Marathas, the Tamils, the Kanarese, the Telegus, and the Malayalis, to separate States formed on a linguistic basis. With the advent of the British, North and South were brought under one system of administration, a system which prevailed for nearly two centuries. British rulers made no attempt to organise the South in provinces based on race or language; in most cases they simply took over the political divisions as they found them. Thus Madras was, till independence, a great amorphous province in which Kanarese, Malayalis, and Tamils held separate tracts of country; the Central Provinces (now Madhya Pradesh) had a strong Maratha element; Bombay had Kanarese, Marathas, and Gujaratis. The administration of the vast territories in question made the employment of Indians on a large scale imperative: the Brahmins came into their own. In the first century of British rule they almost monopolised the junior appointments in the civil administration and the judicial system; some of them got as far as the High Courts; others in course of time were promoted to the higher levels of the bureaucracy. They were prominent in the professions, the Bar, medicine, engineering, journalism. English had by this time gone a long way towards bridging the gaps between North and South by creating in both regions an English-speaking élite, in which the Brahmins were strongly represented.

But the Brahmins had no monopoly of intelligence; at the beginning of the century their supremacy was challenged by the development of a strong anti-Brahmin movement in the South. By 1918, when the Montagu-Chelmsford Commission was set up to report on constitutional reforms, the influence of the non-Brahmin party,

representing the Dravidian peoples, had spread so widely that its leaders succeeded in persuading the Commission to give non-Brahmins separate representation ; the result was to put the non-Brahmin in power in the new dyarchic government, with unpleasant consequences to the Brahmins. The revolutionary Indian Congress about this period adopted the policy of reorganising the southern province on a linguistic basis and pledged itself to carry through the policy once it had acquired the necessary power.

The question was raised soon after independence. Speaking in the Constituent Assembly on Nov. 27, 1947, Pundit Nehru, while accepting the linguistic principle, remarked, ' first things must come first and the first thing is the security and stability of India.' This was followed by the appointment of the Dar Commission for the purpose of advising the Government on the desirability of setting up any of the proposed provinces of Andhra (Telugu), Karnataka, Kerala (Travancore, Cochin, and Malabar), and Maharashtra. It reported in December 1948, expressing itself strongly against any reorganisation being undertaken in then existing circumstances : the formation of provinces exclusively or even mainly on linguistic considerations was, it thought, inadvisable. The Indian Congress, however, was not prepared to leave the problem *in vacuo* as suggested by the Commission, and a week or two later appointed another committee of three, Pundit Jawahir Lal Nehru, Sirdar V. Patel, and Dr Pattabhi Sitaramayya (known as the J.V.P. Committee). It commented on the difficulties and dangers involved in accepting the linguistic principle in provincial administration, but was of the opinion that if public sentiment was insistent and overwhelming, the possibility of meeting the public demand would have to be examined. A beginning might be made with the creation of Andhra. It remarked further that when Congress had given its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from its practical application. Obviously at this stage Pundit Nehru and the Congress Working Committee were anxious to defer action as long as possible.

With the growing emphasis on linguism in the South, Delhi could hardly expect its policy of introducing Hindi, a northern Aryan language, as the national language of India, to be welcomed south of the Vindhya. The Dravidians, indeed, gave it a hostile reception: there were riotous demonstrations against the proposal in many places; public notices in Hindi were torn down. Strong objections were taken to the suggestion that Hindi should be prescribed as the language in examinations for the public services. Mr Gandhi tried to effect a compromise by proposing that Hindustani, a blend of Urdu and Hindi, should be adopted. This would have had some attraction for the forty million Muslims in India who regard Urdu as their national language; it is said that the Marathas might have accepted it. It did not commend itself to the Hindus.

Agitation in Telegu country soon brought matters to a crisis. The Telegus were determined to have a country of their own and to break away from their Tamil neighbours, who, they considered, had too large a share of official appointments in their part of the world. The Telegus wanted Madras city; they also claimed the Telegu country in the Hyderabad State; in fact Dravidians generally demanded the disintegration of the Nizam's dominions. Pundit Nehru was prepared to consider the Telegu claim to an Andhra province; the Tamils would strenuously resist handing over Madras, which they regarded as the capital of their country; a compromise Pundit Nehru thought might be necessary that would give it to neither by constituting it as a City State.

Delhi disliked the idea of breaking up Hyderabad: it was felt in official circles that the continuance of the State with a Congress ministry more or less influenced from the Centre helped to maintain political equilibrium in South India. No action was, however, taken. 'We are,' many Dravidian leaders thought, 'up against the age-old contempt of the Aryan for the native Dravidian.' At last Pundit Nehru's hand was forced. An Andhra fanatic decided to follow Gandhi's example and start a fast to death unless Delhi gave way. He died on the fifteenth day of his ordeal. A tempest of wrath swept from end to end of Andhra; railway stations were looted, trains held up, and the administration paralysed; the police on

several occasions were compelled to fire on riotous mobs, involving many casualties. The crisis had to be faced ; Andhra was to be formed : a High Court Judge was appointed to settle the boundaries against its Kanarese and Tamil neighbours. Hyderabad was left intact ; so was Madras City. Thus on Oct. 1, 1953, the Andhra State of the Telegus came into existence. A legislature was formed by the transfer to the new unit of the 146 Telegu members of the Madras Assembly, with the Communists the strongest party.

The bringing into existence of the Andhra State was the thin edge of the wedge in the problem of the re-distribution of the southern provinces. Claims were pressed afresh and not only from the South. West Bengal demanded the handing over to it of 11,000 square miles of Bihar inhabited by Bengali-speaking people on its western border ; the Sikhs, who felt that Hindu communalism was a threat to their existence, demanded a Panjabi-speaking State as their homeland, which would include the east Panjab and Pepsu (Patiala and the Panjab States Union). The All-India Linguistic States Union put forward a demand for the immediate setting up of a commission to fix the boundaries of the future States of Maharashtra and Gujarat ; Tamilnad (Madras) and Karnataka ; and on the western side of the Ghauts, of the Kerala State to be formed from the princely States of Travancore and Cochin with the Madras district of Malabar. There were debates in the Lok Sabha (House of the People) on the subject, so stormy that the atmosphere of the House was described in the Press as resembling a 'boiling cauldron.' There was serious agitation in Travancore in July 1953 ; on one occasion the police had to open fire on rioters attempting to hold up trains ; several people were killed and many injured. There were similar demonstrations in Bombay and Madras. A measure of conciliation was inevitable : it took the form of a declaration by Pundit Nehru in April 1953 that the Indian Government had no objection in principle to the reconstitution of the southern provinces and would, after experience of the working of the new State of Andhra, appoint a States Reorganisation Commission which would report to Government on the whole question as it affected both North and South.

The Commission was appointed on Dec. 29, 1953. It consisted of three members, Saiyyid Fazl Ali, a retired judge of the Supreme Court; Pundit Harday Nath Kunzru, a member of the Upper House of Parliament; and Sardar K. M. Pannikar, recently Indian ambassador at Cairo. It submitted its findings and report in October of last year, a document of 267 pages described in a prominent journal as in the best traditions of the Indian Civil Service! During its enquiry, the Commission received 152,250 memoranda, petitions, and communications, and interviewed 9,000 persons. The report is unanimous but for two exceptions; the Chairman would keep the Simla Hill States (Himachal) under the Centre for strategic reasons; Sardar Pannikar thinks administrative efficiency would be promoted by dividing the big State of Uttar Pradesh (formerly the United Provinces) unwieldy with its population of 63 millions.

The Commission recommended sweeping changes. Of India's existing twenty-seven States, only Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, and Kashmir remain unaffected by their proposals. Of the nine Part C States, seven are to be merged in the adjacent provinces; two, Delhi and Manipur, are to be centrally administered areas. Part B States, formerly princely States, disappear, with the exception of Hyderabad, the Telegu districts of which should, it is suggested, be formed into a State. Travancore-Cochin is merged with Malabar to form the Kerala State. The Mysore State and Coorg, combined with all the other Kanarese areas in Madras, Hyderabad, and Bombay, form the new State of Karnataka. Saurashtra and Kutch are amalgamated with the Gujarati country north of Bombay. Madhya Bharat (originally the princely States of Indore and Gwalior with some smaller units) goes into Madhya Pradesh (formerly the Central Provinces), which is further reinforced by the inclusion of Bhopal and Vindhya Pradesh (formerly princely States of Rewah and other units), and the Maratha districts of Hyderabad, making it, with an area of 171,000 square miles, the largest of all the Indian States. Pepsu and Himachal are to go to the East Panjab, Ajmere is to be taken over by Rajasthan and Tripura by Assam. The Commission would abolish the institution of Raja-pramukh, which makes the governorship of some of the provinces formed from princely States hereditary;

in their opinion these princely vestiges attract loyalties which should go to strengthen Indian nationalism. Madras cedes its Kanarese territory and Malabar, but gains a small bloc of Tamil country from Travancore-Cochin. It retains Madras city as its capital. The new State of Karnataka is composed of parts of Madras, as already noted, and parts of southern Bombay and Hyderabad. The Maratha ideal of a great Maharashtra, including Bombay and city, is rejected. The Marathas, if the Commission's views are accepted, must be content with a small new State, Vidharba, built up of the Maratha districts of Madhya Pradesh; it would have an area of 36,880 square miles and a population of 7.6 millions. On the other hand, Bombay gets the Maratha districts of Hyderabad in the South and Saurashtra and Kutch in the Gujarati sphere. As against these additions, it loses its Kanarese country, as has been noted already. With the Gujarati and Maratha additions, Bombay would have an area of 150,000 square miles. The fact that Pepsu goes to the East Panjab shows that the Commission were not prepared to meet the Sikh claims. They were, in particular, critical of the Sikh claim to a homeland which, with its implication of national exclusiveness, they thought inconsistent with Indian democracy. They were not averse to allowing the remnant State of Hyderabad to opt to join Andhra, if after the elections of 1961 the Assembly wished to do so. Would His Exalted Highness be allowed to stay on as Governor meanwhile, or would he finally accept political extermination and retire to Bombay as a private individual? West Bengal, which had hoped to achieve a more or less adequate hinterland for its great capital city of Calcutta, has to content itself with 3,000 square miles as against 13,000 to which it thought linguistic considerations entitled it.

Special safeguards are recommended for linguistic minorities: State governors would be responsible for their implementation. In the interests of national unity the reconstitution of certain all-Indian Services is proposed, such as the Indian Forest and Engineering Service and the Health and Medical Services. There should be interchange of High Court Judges. Fifty per cent. of the new entrants in the All-Indian service should be from outside the States concerned. English should, even after the adoption of Hindi for official and educational purposes, continue to

have an important place in the universities and institutions of higher learning.

The Commission were not prepared to regard linguistic homogeneity as a predominant factor in the forming of the provinces. It should only be taken into account with other considerations such as economic stability, culture, strategy, facility of communication, and so on. A final decision on the report should, the Commission thought, take into account the effect any of the changes might have on economic planning.

The publication of the Report was received with widespread protest and criticism. Savage rioting followed in Bombay, engineered by Marathas, who would not accept anything less than a unified Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital. For several days the city was in a state of siege, with 10,000 armed police fighting huge mobs. The Gandhi cap exposed its wearers to unpleasant attention. Fifteen people were killed and hundreds received gunshot wounds. In Vindhya Pradesh a mob invaded the legislature and stoned the members. The Akali Sikhs staged *satyagraha*; they had courted arrest in thousands before the publication of the report. West Bengal felt it had been unfairly treated. There was trouble in Assam. Violent demonstrations occurred in other States; Mysoreans were especially indignant at their threatened eclipse.

On the whole it may be assumed that no insoluble difficulties face the Union Government in dealing with the Commission's proposals so far as they affect the Andhra, Madras, Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal, and Assam States. There will be matters of finance to settle; in some cases readjustments of boundaries may be necessary. Tact and patience on the part of Delhi should clear the political atmosphere.

The outstanding problems which will test the statesmanship and courage of Pundit Nehru and his colleagues concern the demands of the Sikhs and Marathas, to conciliate whom is all the more necessary because of their military record and of their important position in the Indian army. To the Marathas the Congress High Command offered a province enlarged by the inclusion in south Bombay of the Maratha districts of Hyderabad and of the proposed State of Vidharba, in other words, practically the whole of Maratha country. But there was one

provision the Marathas were not prepared to accept; they were not to have Bombay City: that would become a city State. Gujarati country as expanded by the Commission would be a separate State.

The Sikh *impasse* is, if anything, more difficult of solution. A Sikhistan formed of Pepsu and the surrounding country would, it was thought, hardly be viable. In the enlarged province proposed by the Commission, Hindus would be in an overwhelming majority. The Hindus do not like the Sikhs; the Sikhs mistrust the Hindus. As Master Tara Singh, the Sikh leader, remarked recently, he was not fighting nationalism; he was fighting against communalism under the garb of nationalism. What might satisfy the less extreme elements among the Sikhs is a scheme which would give them a Panjabi *Subah* or province which, while being of adequate proportions, would exclude regions where the Hindus are in an overwhelming majority. Such a province has been discussed in Delhi, and it is believed one might be formed in which the Sikhs would have 45 per cent. of the population, which should be adequate for protecting their interests. The report was debated at length in parliament in Delhi during last December, but no final decision was come to at the time. It is thought that the matter will be finally dealt with at the budget session in April, the conclusions then reached to be carried out in October. Pundit Nehru was inclined to think the appointment of the Commission had been a blunder, but he was prepared to make every effort to bring about an equitable settlement, having regard to the essential condition of maintaining Indian security. He put forward a new proposal: to divide the whole country after reorganisation into five zones, north, south, east, and west, with a fifth in the centre. Each zone would have a council which would be concerned with economic and administrative policy. The suggestion attracted support in some political circles, especially where a reaction was setting in against some of the unfavourable aspects of linguistic States; Pundit Nehru's scheme had, it was thought, the merit of providing at least something resembling an antidote to separation.

That feeling ran high in the Rajya Sabha (the Upper House) while the report was under discussion, as suggested by a description of the proceedings in 'Shankar,' the

leading humorous paper of Delhi. 'Anger, acrimony, and aggressiveness were,' it says, 'displayed in Parliament over the blue book which bid fair to attain in Indian history the place of Pandora's box in Greek mythology. Pundit Kunzru only stayed in the Rajya Sabha so long as the Commission got bouquets: he left when brickbats began to be hurled in truckloads. Mr Gadgil's cry that the issue was being decided in the streets of Bombay was equalled by Shri Kantan Nair's solemn declaration that the people of Kerala would shed the last drop of their blood rather than cede a small patch of Tamil territory to Madras.'

The terms of reference of the Commission included a direction that when dealing with Assam they should consider future policy in the North-Eastern Frontier Agency; whether, for example, a separate State should be formed or whether the tribal areas should be placed under a Commissioner in direct relations with the Centre. There had been trouble with the tribesmen since independence: the Nagas had claimed a separate State; later they staged a revolt; a punitive expedition had been necessary; there had been fighting in which fifty Nagas lost their lives. The Commission thought that the trouble with the tribes was due to the British policy of segregation, a policy, they said, that was enforced against Indians rather than against Europeans or Christians. In this view of the position they had the support of Pundit Nehru, who after touring the Naga area in October last recorded a note in which he expressed the opinion that British officers and missionaries had encouraged the Nagas to think of independence when they grew certain that Britain would hand over India to Congress. The truth seems to be that British policy in the area aimed at preventing the exploitation of primitive folk by Hindu moneylenders or traders. It would not be surprising that, when opportunity offered, people of the latter class who had been frustrated by British policy in their schemes of economic adventure should take the opportunity of spreading libels against British officers and missionaries. The Commission was not prepared to recommend the forming of a State of the tribal areas in north-east and south-east Assam and advised the Government to constitute them as a separate agency under the direct control of the Centre. It would be necessary, the

Commission noted, to pass legislation to keep out the moneylender !

Pundit Nehru in the middle of January decided that prompt action was necessary in dealing with the Marathas. He made it clear that they would have to accept the scheme which gives them southern Bombay with practically all Maratha territory, but denies them the great city itself. There is little doubt that this is a fair compromise and one admires Pundit Nehru for his courage in deciding to carry it through despite its unpopularity with those concerned. One feels that the Marathas will accept it in the end. After all, there is no valid Maratha tradition as regards the making of Bombay. The city is in fact a British creation and there can be no genuine Maratha sentiment in the matter. Their claim to it is doubtless inspired by the desire to control a huge and wealthy city and to be able to utilise its resources. It is true that most of the hundred thousand mill operatives speak Marathi : the mills were set up by British and Gujarati capitalists. Maharashtra will be economically viable, but its resources are limited and it will need financial aid. The headworks of the hydro-electric system that produces Bombay's power are in Maharashtra territory ; Bombay owes much of its prosperity to its Maharashtra hinterland ; it would not be unreasonable in all the circumstances for Bombay to give the State a reasonable subvention. It is a matter of regret that Pundit Nehru's ultimatum led to an outburst of mob violence in Bombay in which many lives were lost.

A settlement of the Maratha problem should have favourable reactions in the dispute with the Sikhs. They should realise that *satyagraha* or violent political agitation in any form does not pay, a development which might bring about a change of mood and induce acceptance of the alternative referred to in an earlier paragraph, which would give them adequate influence in the political life of the country.

It is to be hoped that it will be possible to make some concession to Mysore in recognition of over a century of sound and progressive administration. Could not the Kanarese province be called Mysore, with Bangalore as its capital, if it is not possible to evolve a satisfactory arrangement otherwise ? The proposal that the teaching language of the Osmania University of Hyderabad, which

for a generation or more has been Urdu, should be displaced by Hindi, will cause distress to Muslims both within and outside India. It would be a graceful act on the part of Delhi to leave the position of Urdu there as it is now. Muslims generally will regret the breaking up of the Hyderabad State, but in existing political conditions it seems inevitable. The Indian Government will doubtless consider whether it is worth while to make a slight concession to Muslim sentiment by allowing the small State, with Hyderabad as its capital, proposed by the Commission, to exist for a few years longer.

Indian nationalism is a delicate plant and its growth might be impeded by parochial leanings in the non-Aryan South as a result of concessions to linguism. A settlement with the Marathas would remove a major irritant in the contest of the South with the Centre: Tamils, Telegus, Malayalis, and Kanarese can hardly expect more than the Commission offer them; they will almost certainly accept them. In such circumstances, the political climate in the South should clear: It might be further improved by a setting up of Pundit's Nehru's zonal system, especially if it should lead to a full consideration by the Centre of the development schemes in the various provinces. About one in six of the people of the South are untouchables; they are not very likely to identify themselves with the caste Hindus in anything suggesting opposition to the Centre. It might be worth while to attract their loyalty by special concessions in the economic and educational fields. Communists are active in the South and are likely to fish in troubled waters: some of their leaders advocate a falling away from Delhi. Political stability should help to keep the movement within bounds. And when all is said and done, a Hindu of the South, although he may not have much in common with a Hindu in the North, is still a Hindu first and they both think and act as such. Religion is still an overriding influence in the East, where nationalism is only a latterday development. Hinduism should win the day so long as it maintains its present hold on the mind of India.

W. BARTON.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Georgian Cabinet Makers.** Ralph Edwards and Margaret Jourdain.
Reminiscences. Marchioness Curzon of Kedleston.
Man on his Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship. Herbert Butterfield.
Young Samuel Johnson. Professor James L. Clifford.
New Hope in Africa. J. H. Oldham.
The Incomplete Gardener. Alfred Noyes.
Excursion to Russia. Joyce Egginton.
Kuwait was my Home. Zahra Freeth.
Kwame Nkrumah. Bankole Timothy.
The Foreseeable Future. Sir George Thomson.
- Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-1846.** Gordon Ray.
Selected Literary Criticism. D. H. Lawrence.
Pope's Dunciad. Aubrey L. Williams.
Amphibian: A Reconstruction of Browning. Henry Charles Duffin.
An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England. Peter Hunter Blair.
The Colonial Office. Sir Charles Jeffries, K.C.M.G.
Questions in the House. Patrick Howarth.
Russian Holiday. Allan Chappelow.
Winston Churchill. Lewis Broad.
New Readings in Shakespeare. C. J. Sisson.

A NEW EDITION of the notable and valuable work 'Georgian Cabinet Makers,' by Ralph Edwards and Margaret Jourdain (Country Life), is most welcome. It is more than ten years since the last edition appeared and in the interval before and after Miss Jourdain's death, considerable new material has come to light, largely due to the publication of Sir Ambrose Heal's 'The London Furniture Makers, 1600-1840' and the very useful clues which it gives to many craftsmen otherwise forgotten. A good deal, too, has been discovered elsewhere about furniture makers such as William Vile, whose work adorns several royal palaces and famous houses. Close on a hundred furniture makers are dealt with in this volume and all available details of their lives and work given. The eighteenth century was the golden age of English furniture makers and it has often been a tribulation for connoisseurs and collectors to be unable to pin down the actual makers of outstanding pieces. Gratitude is therefore due to Mr Edwards and Miss Jourdain for the help that they have given as the result of long years of study and comparison. The volume is enriched by over 230 plates, well chosen to illustrate the varying styles, fashions, and workmanship of the period—all well produced in the eminent Country Life style. The work is from its nature primarily one of reference but there

is much more general information included, and any lover of furniture can open and study the book with pleasure and profit anywhere.

'**Reminiscences,**' by the Marchioness Curzon of Kedleston (Hutchinson), is a book which may well give welcome ammunition to left-wing snipers and critics, who delight in condemning privilege—not without reference to the 'lilies of the field.' Lady Curzon was fortunate in having almost everything that the world desires, beauty, charm, health, wealth, high position, friends in royal and aristocratic circles and in all other circles that she might choose, immense opportunities of entertaining and being entertained, Court, diplomatic, and official ceremonies—and in the (we hope long delayed) end a special shelf among the velvet-covered coffins in the family vault at Kedleston reserved for her in his own handwriting by Lord Curzon!

She tells of her early days in the U.S.A. and her first marriage to Alfred Duggan, an Argentine millionaire who, however, soon transferred his domicile to this country. So England has been Lady Curzon's home for by far the larger part of her life—and not only just England but also several of the finest and most stately homes in this country. The eight years of her marriage to Lord Curzon are naturally the most interesting portion of the book and throw new light on that brilliant, varied, and complicated man and his private and official background. He was a man of immense knowledge, a stately and skilful orator, an experienced politician, a great Proconsul in India, an art connoisseur of more than amateur status. He achieved every honour that he coveted except the Premiership—and he was not satisfied. Letters in this book show his deep and lasting grievance that his services to Crown and Empire were never properly appreciated and that others got the credit which he thought was due to him. He was a great man with astonishing streaks of pettiness. For these Curzon years at any rate the book is historically valuable and a remarkable period-piece.

'**Man on his Past. The Study of the History of Historical Scholarship,**' by Herbert Butterfield, Master of Peterhouse and Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge (Cambridge University Press), consists of lectures given for the Wiles Trust in Queen's University of Belfast. Its aim is to describe and illustrate the rise,

the scope, the methods, and the objectives of the history of historiography, treating this not as an account of a branch of literature, but as, so to speak, a subsection in the history of science. It examines the internal development of historical scholarship, always relating it to movements in general history and to the progress of other sciences. Professor Butterfield tells us much about the rise of the German historical school, especially at Göttingen, of Lord Acton and the nineteenth-century historical movement, and of Ranke and the conception of General History. Two very interesting chapters are given to two specific events, the history of the enquiry into the origins of the Seven Years' War and the Massacre of St Bartholomew. By process of erudite exposition and detection it is shown what entirely different results can be obtained from successive revelations of evidence from archives and how much the same evidence can be coloured or twisted by political or other circumstances of the time. 'Teach to look behind historians,' wrote Lord Acton, 'especially famous historians.' Professor Butterfield heeds this well. His book will primarily be of great use to writers of history, but even the general public, when reading history, needs guidance in speculating on the authority of statements of historians.

Professor James L. Clifford begins his '**Young Samuel Johnson**' (Heinemann) with the words, 'Everyone thinks of Dr Johnson as an old man. At the first mention of his name the vision rises of the familiar massive, wrinkled face, the bushy bob wig and the dull brown coat.' There used to be an impression that there was little known about the pre-Boswell Johnson, yet Professor Clifford has successfully filled 350 and more pages with the young Samuel up to the age of forty, leaving him still harassed by poverty, though with the clouds rolling by, the 'Dictionary' in active compilation, with a more assured position in Fleet Street and brighter prospects, though with the position of Great Cham of literature yet to come. We are shown the moody, unhappy, ambitious young man full of confidence in himself and bitterly resenting past failure, prone to melancholic and a slave to indolence, though no one could work harder when really put to it. This book corrects the myths about the year at Oxford. Samuel was not in menial and degrading circumstances, but an ordinary commoner. We

learn much about his relations with his Tetty, which were not as happy as he, after her death, was inclined to maintain. We are given a good picture of his strange circle of friends in Grub Street in the early 1740's: 'Bohemian poets, impractical realists, reformed impostors, eager inventors, drunken rakes, and serious clergymen.' The whole book is an able study of that remarkable man who could be so great and so kindly, yet often managed to be so petty and almost repulsive.

'**New Hope in Africa,**' by J. H. Oldham (Longmans), is an account of the aims and activities of the Capricorn Africa Society—an organisation which indeed deserves to be better known than it is. 'C.A.S. is a deliberate attempt, however foolhardy it may appear, to turn in a new direction the currents of human thought, feeling, and action that seem to be hurrying Capricorn Africa to disaster.' 'Its purpose is to create an understanding of the promise offered by the plan of an inter-racial society animated by a common African patriotism, to rally public support for the idea, to make clear what it implies and demands, and to bring about legislation in which it will find full constitutional embodiment.' Racial relations are deteriorating in many parts of the continent, and prejudice is violent. Dr Oldham makes a strong case, but to many he will seem to make too light of the mixing of races and its results, nor does he explain how C.A.S. is organised nor what its personnel consists of, nor what exactly they do—and that is an unfortunate omission. But the book gives rise to deep thought. The tide of African nationalism is rising every year. Something must be done to avoid disaster and C.A.S. at any rate points out one way.

It is pleasing to meet an old friend—none the less pleasing if he comes under a new name and in new clothes. Such is the case with Alfred Noyes' '**The Incomplete Gardener**' (Sheed and Ward), first published twenty years ago under the title of 'Orchard's Bay.' The book is indeed about a garden, appealing to all who love gardens, but it is really concerned more with wisdom than weed-killing, more with poetry than with pruning. A garden is of course a wonderful place in which to find pegs—or trees, flowers, pools, borders, birds, butterflies, lawns, hedges, or even a classical temple or statue—on which to hang views of life, customs, history, religion, myths, scholarship, or

indeed almost any subject of interest to human beings. Mr Noyes' beautiful Isle of Wight garden has all these advantages, in its attractive and sheltered position, with the steep cliff behind, the ample trees on each side, and in front the view of the English Channel across lawn and meadow. The book is adorned with many poems both by the author and by others, and it is inspired by idealism, love of the country, and wide knowledge of birds and beasts and flowers. It can be read through or dipped into with real pleasure at any time and should be possessed, not borrowed.

'**Excursion to Russia,**' by Joyce Egginton (Hutchinson), is just what the title suggests, a holiday enjoyed by twenty-six young Englishmen and Englishwomen (and one somewhat outsize American) by special arrangement and of course well shepherded by Russian guides and interpreters. The tour covered Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad, the Crimea, and some of the Ukraine. The special interest of the party was in people and not in politics, but no one can altogether escape the intense and increasing political propaganda. The author writes 'the more I saw of it, the more I realise how impossible it is to form judgment—as hopeless as trying to shade in a rainbow with a single palette of paint. Like the rainbow, Russia is all colours and it is no colour, its beginning is hazy and its ending is over the hill.' Everywhere the party met kindness, and much care was taken over arrangements for them—but of course these arrangements had to be kept absolutely. They saw what was staged for them—but no peeping behind the curtain! They found the usual ignorance of life in capitalist countries and the customary praise of Soviet Russia. Miss Egginton is a skilled, lively, and attractive reporter and her work gives an excellent account of holiday-makers' Russia, with discerning commentary.

'**Kuwait was my Home,**' by Zahra Freeth (Allen and Unwin), is the story of a small, obscure, out-of-the-way, old-fashioned Persian Gulf port which in the course of a few years has become a large and flourishing industrial centre of 300,000 or more inhabitants, with streets of modern buildings and up-to-date equipment, overshadowing the old Arab town of narrow streets and mud walls. This is all due to oil, which brings in revenues of 60,000,000l, or so a year, a large portion of which the enlightened ruler

spends on improving his domain, education, health matters, sanitation, etc. The author spent her childhood in Kuwait, where her father was British Political Officer, and much of her life since, though she is now resident in England. She is thus very well qualified to write about Kuwait as it was and as it is—the people, their customs, manners of life, superstitions, prejudices, achievements, and aims. The changes have been remarkable, but 'the suddenness with which wealth has flowed into Kuwait has allowed no time for a gradual evolution towards education and progress. The Kuwaitis are not yet fully aware of the problems which press upon them with the progressive westernising of their town . . . popular feeling already showing signs of nascent nationalism is eager to be done with the British help,' though indeed they are still too inexperienced to run their own state satisfactorily. Mrs Freeth gives an interesting, perceptive, and well-balanced account of an unusual development in the progress of so-called civilisation.

'**Kwame Nkrumah**,' by Bankole Timothy (George Allen and Unwin), is certainly a timely book when events are moving quickly in West Africa and further great developments are foreshadowed. Nkrumah, the first Prime Minister of a self-governing Gold Coast, was born in poverty and made his own way by determination, compelling ambition, foresight, and skill. His early education was in the Gold Coast, thence he went to U.S.A. with a scholarship and thereafter to London. Then he returned home to pursue his political career with the slogan 'Self-government now.' He admits to being a Marxian Socialist and he was a persistent agitator and thorn in the flesh of the Government. In fact he was in prison when the party which he led swept the polls at the first general election and he came out to be Prime Minister. He was—and is—a hard fighter, at times ruthless; he has no interests outside politics and he aims at a general West African Federation with himself in the seat of power, but, while maintaining full self-government, he is determined to stay within the British Commonwealth of Nations. Mr Timothy tells his story rather in the style of a factual business report, illuminating without being specially graceful, but that report is valuable in showing the growth of nationalistic spirit in West Africa and we in this country can learn useful lessons from it.

Sir George Thomson says that it automatically follows from the adjective in his title '**The Foreseeable Future**' (Cambridge University Press) that the book should confine itself to technology; and he also takes it to mean the next hundred years or so.

The author is famous for his contribution to the quantum theory and he won the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1937; however, his book, far from leaning towards the specialised aspect, shows that he has constantly related his own scientific endeavour to the many fields of study of the revealed universe.

Work on organising committees governing applied science has no doubt equipped him to delineate so clearly the main over-riding scientific principles accepted in our day. He does not rule out that some of these may be modified in the future, but he takes them as a necessary basis for prediction now. And from this starting-point his forecast ranges over energy and power, materials, transport and communications, meteorology, food, biology, and studies of electronic computers and of the human brain.

His practical, reasoned basis makes the survey a challenge to forward-thinking industry and an inspiration to young scientists. At the same time, for the layman its soberness makes it even more absorbing than science fiction. Here, the excitement is in following the clear factual grounds for Sir George Thomson's examination of television, telephones, climate and mutation control, the 'programming' of electric brains, deserts irrigated by 'freshened' sea-water, and so on.

In a chapter towards the end of his book, the author treats of some possible consequences in employment and education of the predictions he makes. Whilst it is interesting to have a scientific turn of mind at work on such matters, it is apparent in, for example, the section on 'The Future of the Stupid,' that here the scientist's approach cannot safely be isolated. Poets, prophets, saints, and leaders of men will surely continue even in a technological age to have a very big say in these aspects of the destiny of Man.

When Mr Gordon Ray's 'Letters and Private Papers of W. M. Thackeray' appeared it proved that here was a Thackeray authority immensely reliable and informed. Mr Ray's '**Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811-**

1846' (O.U.P.) is the first half of a two-volume biography. Mr Ray has nothing of the approach of the interpreter. His aim is to present a reliable and authentic account of Thackeray's life. It is documented thoroughly and with great exactness. It is fair to say, though, that it leans rather to the viewpoint of the 'good' in every conventional and customary sense. The idea that Thackeray may have had what are vulgarly known as 'skeletons in the cupboard' and that there are revelations to be made about his private life is dismissed by Mr Ray with a rather lofty impatience. The assumption that if there were in fact such things then Thackeray would be less admirable sometimes gives the book a slight air of genteel obsequies. This feeling is not very operative, but it is strong enough at times to be a little disconcerting. Mr Ray has used many hitherto untapped sources for his material—the whole of the correspondence between Thackeray and his principal publishers and over two hundred letters of Mrs Brookfield to her husband. This full-length biography is also authorised by the Thackeray family. The picture of the novelist that comes out is highly provocative and tremendously interesting because of the intricacies of his character. It also provokes conjecture as to why a man who could create a raffish sophisticate like Becky Sharp could also make a heroine out of the wholly ineffectual Amelia. Thackeray himself reflects these two strange opposites. One is often tempted to conclude, if one dare generalise about such a man, that much of it was due to a dichotomy of personality brought about by the deliberate subjugation of a wild natural spirit to a powerful, crippling social convention. He never found the way to ignore whether Society was on his heels or not!

It is difficult to admit the individual genius of D. H. Lawrence when an estimate of him is based wholly on the novels. This is understandable, of course, in view of the fact that he used symbols in the novels which can so easily be misunderstood or not understood at all and in many cases, of course, tend by their boldness to antagonise. Lawrence was not very subtle in his use of symbols. In his literary criticism, where he was writing with a much more objective approach, his point of view is much more palatable since he does take the trouble to explain and to leave the reader in no doubt as to what his opinion is.

'Selected Literary Criticism,' by D. H. Lawrence, edited by Anthony Beal (Heinemann), is a volume to be welcomed. The selection is made with great discrimination and with an awareness of the things which best express Lawrence's point of view. Lawrence himself never published his literary criticisms except for one volume on classic American Literature. Some of his essays, on the other hand, were published, and Mr Beal has ranged over these as well as the criticisms. It is surprisingly accepted still that there was something of the pornographer about Lawrence, a viewpoint as absurd as it is unjust. He was a writer of great seriousness, of dedicated insistence that the literary craft was a vital life-force. He was a man to whom the passionate involvement with life was life itself. He was entirely unashamed of his ideas, uncompromising and direct, perhaps a little too insistent and sometimes a little too shrill on the rightness of his conviction, but in essence reasonable and concerned with human happiness and fulfilment. Some of his extreme attitudes were due to a weary impatience with the deliberate attacks on him by people who seemed incapable of understanding in any way what his motivation was. Reverence comes in all kinds of guises: this comprehensive selection of Lawrence's writings illuminates continually the rare and reverent spirit in which he saw the human predicament, brought about by a sad refusal to accept the freedom and spontaneous happiness of its own nature.

'Pope's Dunciad,' by Aubrey L. Williams (Methuen), is an academic annotation and explanation of a poem nowadays more talked of than read. Mr Williams's book is for the specialist and for the student—an advanced student at that. The personal attacks on Pope's contemporaries which make the texture of the poem are tedious in such bulk, though of course Pope's turn of phrase in invective and his scale constantly give something of interest and note. All these things Mr Williams is aware of. He also is very illuminating on the classical similes and the larger ideas which make the framework into which Pope wove his critical scorn and contumely. But his book, it must be confessed, is rather hard going. One needs to be as familiar with the poem, and to have the same admiration for it as he has, fully to appreciate the

SOME RECENT BOOKS

267

care and the explanatory tenseness which he brings to it. The original form of the book was a dissertation and this was awarded the John Addison Porter Prize at Yale University. This possibly accounts for the lack of lightness in it now that it has been extended into a full volume. He regards Pope as a moralist and sees the poem as a moral attack on the threat levelled by the Dunces at the culture and morals that obtained in the early eighteenth century. Pope was so much a child of his time that the slight hyperbole of his slashing rejoinder may be due to this. Mr Williams is sane and logical. Nevertheless at times he does seem to allow a partisan attitude to appear in his assessment of the poem and by coming down on the side of the supporters of Pope he tends to ignore those equally equipped commentators who concluded that Pope at times was very much carried away by his spleen and that some of his attacks were both ill-judged and unfair.

'I owe a considerable debt to Browning, and have taken what he (if he is still growling at critics) must regard as an odd way of repaying it. Browning, more than anyone except my wife, made my life the excellent thing it has been.' So goes the first sentences of the Foreword of **'Amphibian: A Reconstruction of Browning'** by Henry Charles Duffin (Bowes & Bowes). (The title is chosen, by the way, to register Mr Duffin's view that Browning was one of the few English poets who were poet and moralist at the same time.) It is obvious that the book is the work of a devotee, but it is none the worse for that, and in fact it is full of such warm appreciation and understanding of Browning that one is a little surprised at his attack on Betty Miller's recent study of Browning. Mr Duffin's admiration gives him an extraordinarily satisfying insight into a difficult poet. He has planned his book in two parts: one of 35 pages dealing with the man, and the other up to 308 pages dealing with the poet. He writes with the glow of the happiness of his own enjoyment of Browning. He never distrusts, he always makes the charitable explanation, he reads into the poems positive affirmations of the Brownings' love for each other rather than negations, and he discusses the poems themselves with such understanding that the interest is held and stimulated. It is a most admirable tribute and must have an important place in any Browning collection. What is

a little puzzling is, that knowing Browning so well, he should see in Mrs Miller's book a 'denigration.' Indeed, he says of it, 'I call the book perverse because it sets out to debunk, to denigrate, and manipulates material to that end.' This is a serious charge. It strikes the reviewer as odd that Mrs Miller's book could be so regarded in view of her wonderful understanding of the intricate relationship that existed between the poets. Mr Duffin also has this understanding, though he sees it from a different angle. There is, in fact, plenty of room for both the books on a man of such fertile complexity.

'An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England,' by Peter Hunter Blair (Cambridge University Press), is a valuable and instructive book about a period of seven centuries of our history from the departure of the Romans to the Norman Conquest. During that period England was invaded three times, first by the Anglo-Saxons, then by the Scandinavians and finally by the Normans. There were only two periods of comparative freedom both from internal war and the threat of external invasion. The country was divided and redivided again and again between kingdoms, earldoms and provinces and never knew peace except under strong kings like Alfred or Cnut. The first part of the book gives a survey of Anglo-Saxon England. The remainder is devoted to particular and important aspects of its culture, the Church, the secular government, the formation of its economy, its artistic and literary achievement, which was indeed remarkable considering the background of almost continuous strife. The chapter on the Church is particularly illuminating—St Augustine's mission, the Celtic mission and the conflict with Rome, ending in Rome's triumph, then the Church and the Vikings, the Church in early English society and the revival of monasticism. Mr Blair gives a useful bibliography and guides his readers with skill and discernment through a troubled and often dark period of our history.

'The Colonial Office,' by Sir Charles Jeffries, is a notable addition to 'The New Whitehall Series' published by Messrs George Allen & Unwin. Its object is to show briefly the historical forces and accidents which have made the Colonial Office what it is, and the builders who have added fresh storeys to that edifice, and to explain the function of the Office in the complex, informal and con-

stantly shifting pattern of British and Commonwealth constitutional evolution. It gives a short survey of the earlier history of the office but deals more particularly with the years since 1925 when it was separated from the Dominions Office—since called Commonwealth Relations. 'The central purpose of British colonial policy is simple. It is to guide the Colonial territories to responsible self-government within the Commonwealth.' That is the official pronouncement and this book shows briefly how this aim is being fulfilled. The main parts of the work are entitled 'The Secretary of State and his Functions,' 'Background of Colonial Office Work,' 'Colonial Office Organisation' and 'Aspects of Colonial Administration.' A brief account of the colonies and dependant territories over the world shows the amazing variety of conditions and problems involved, and the complexity of the work entailed. Sir Charles writes skilfully, lucidly and concisely and his book well rewards study.

'Questions in the House,' by Patrick Howarth (Bodley Head), is rightly entitled 'The history of a unique British institution.' The author has skilfully developed a hitherto neglected approach to political and constitutional history. It is perhaps a large claim that questions should be as powerful as that, but they have proved themselves an indispensable weapon of attack on major political issues, a means of probing various aspects of administration and of achieving widespread publicity, at times of promoting sectional interests, of bringing about desirable reforms or voicing popular demands, of 'ragging' ministers or of pleasing constituents. Really important information has often been given, sometimes inadvertently, in the answers. The questions have varied from major constitutional issues, involving the powers of the Government, to the debauching of a female prisoner or the chimney pots of Somerset House. Mr Howarth's research into 'Parliamentary History' and 'Parliamentary Debates' must have been immense, for the first question recorded was in 1721 and the book covers all the period up to 1881. It is difficult to decide sometimes whether the questions or the answers are the more astonishing. For the general reader as well as for the student of Parliament this is a delightful and most interesting book and we hope that Mr Howarth will carry on his studies in a further volume.

'**Russian Holiday,**' by Allan Chappelow (Harrap), describes the experiences of the author and some other members of the first group of ordinary tourists to visit Russia since 1939. The tour took place in the summer of 1954, organised by the Travel Department of the National Union of Students. As Sir Norman Angell points out in his preface, 'any book which throws light, as this one does, on the mood, outlook and attitude of to-day's younger generation in Russia is worth attentive reading,' because largely on them lies the future of Russian policy. The party of students were out to enjoy themselves but they also had the more serious purpose of finding out as far as possible how Russians live and what they think. Luckily one of the party was a good Russian linguist and apparently no restrictions were put on direct conversation with Russians met. The tour included Moscow, Stalingrad, the Caucasus and Leningrad and the general picture of life is much more favourable than that usually given in books. Work undoubtedly takes precedence over everything else in Russia, including glamour and personal appearance, and the basic philosophy in education is entirely material, that is anti-religious, though religion is tolerated provided it does not in any way interfere with the secular authorities. This is a good, honest, discerning account of an interesting and rewarding tour.

A new and extended edition of Lewis Broad's '**Winston Churchill**' (Hutchinson) is welcome. The first edition appeared in 1941 and since then other editions have been published bringing the subject up to date. The present one includes the retirement. The sub-title might be 'Hero and Hero Worship.' It is true that Mr Broad allows his hero some faults, 'he does not find it easy to humour incapacity. Pugnacity is his but not tact. . . . Courage and integrity are his. But he is also a highly complicated personality.' All the same in any case of Churchill's disagreements with others Mr Broad takes good care that he does not get the worst of the argument. The work is almost entirely political, dealing with Churchill's public life : there is very little of him in his own home. It might be said that extracts from speeches provide all the bricks for this edifice—Mr Broad supplies the mortar. The drawback is that Churchill himself fills the stage and absorbs the limelight to such an extent that other characters

hardly have a chance of developing. On the subject of the Foreign Secretary being in the Lords when the Prime Minister is in the Commons, Churchill once said 'What is the point in crying out for the moon when you have the sun, when you have the bright orb of day in whose refulgent beams all the lesser luminaries hide their radiance?' That is very apposite for this book. James McGovern, we are told, once said that Churchill 'is the most arrogant and intolerable Member of this House.' Readers of this book will not agree with Mr McGovern. It is an able and instructive study of a truly remarkable character and of a man to whom we all owe deepest gratitude.

There can be no hesitation in saying that the two-volume edition '**New Readings in Shakespeare**,' by C. J. Sisson (C.U.P.), which treats wholly of the obscure passages in Shakespeare's text, is a work of first importance. The publisher claims it to be a by-product of the preparation by Professor Sisson of his recent edition of Shakespeare's works. It is more than this. It is a major work in its own right. The thing that immediately convinces the reader is the straightforwardness of Professor Sisson's approach and his factual interpretation. He had one object in view and that was clarification. He begins, very wisely, in the printer's composing room, and recognises the difficulties of the compositors when faced with the ambiguities and contractions of Elizabethan handwriting, and thus, constantly, when not being able to read the manuscript, guessing or making shots in the dark. Many of the readings they arrived at have a certain modicum of meaning in their context and have been accepted by commentators as valid. But Professor Sisson brings an exceedingly fresh eye to the work. He is, thank goodness, not cluttered in any way by a determination to preserve textual profundities. His approach is the simple one of supposing that what Shakespeare wrote made sense at the time it was written and that where it cannot be understood easily, error must have crept in in the transposition from manuscript to printed book, whether Folio or Quarto. This not only applies to words but to punctuation. He is also extremely considerate of other commentators, though he disagrees with them in many, many cases. He shows how his reading of the text differs from that of others and he is always careful to explain himself fully. Scholarship when applied

in such a way is wholly admirable, though in view of the recent refusal of certain people to admit the authorship of Shakespeare it may seem odd that he has devoted so much time to the works rather than their authorship. Without getting heady with superlatives no private collection of Shakespeariana can be complete without these new commentaries : Professor Sisson is to be congratulated on not only clearing a lot of dead wood out of the way but on contributing something really valuable, vital, and authoritative to an ever-growing *corpus*.

2nd Printing

Housekeeping in the Eighteenth Century

ROSAMOND BAYNE-POWELL

"From mouth-watering recipes to descriptions of mourning-dress, and kitchens, sanitation and silhouettes, the scene is set before us with charm and erudition."—*Sunday Times*.

"She ranges widely, with a light and entertaining touch, over all the domestic interests. She gives us much curious information about customs and superstitions as well as about the organisation of the household."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"Her book can be recommended as a readable, well informed and accurate picture of domestic life in the period."—*The Listener*.

"From this book we can learn what ordinary men and women were like, what they ate and drank, how often they washed, what they thought necessary in the way of sanitation and what they kept in their kitchens and linen and medicine cupboards. She has seasoned a fascinating hutch-potch of information with charm and wit enough to beguile anyone."—*Birmingham Post*.

With Illustrations 18s. net

'My Dear Duchess'

*Social and Political Letters
to the Duchess of Manchester, 1858-68*

Edited by

A. L. KENNEDY

Lord Clarendon's ability as a letter writer has for long brought him some measure of fame as a witty commentator on political and social life. Lord Fitzmaurice, in his *Life of Lord Granville* published half a century ago, claimed that Lord Clarendon would one day, through his letters, enjoy a similar fame to that of Lord Chesterfield. Clarendon's letters have appeared before in various works, but in this book we have a remarkable batch of nearly 100 letters, published mostly for the first time and made available by the Duchess's daughter, the Dowager Countess of Derby. The fascination that this beautiful young woman had over the experienced elderly statesman is quite remarkable. He wrote to her with complete frankness, sometimes as a gossip, sometimes as a wit, sometimes as a remarkably far-seeing politician; but always shrewd and always genial. He was a man of the world with a most admirable ease and simplicity about the social affairs in which he was involved. He also had a very pleasant pen to touch in any personal idiosyncrasies and peccadilloes. The volume also contains a few letters from other important people, such as Lord Granville, Queen Victoria and from other members of the Royal Family.

An extract

May 28/59

"Jane Caledon came here yesterday: more than ever delighted with Osborne & it's inmates. She gave me an amusing acc't of Esterhazy's visit - he bothered (sic) the Queen & arrived at 11 p.m. instead of for dinner which disappointed The Q: who had taken off the covers of the chairs & lustres & put on the blue ribbon for him. His mode of apologizing for this was slipping his hand up the Q's sleeve & tickling her arm & he kept excusing himself in the same way all Monday to the infinite amusement of H.M. . . ."

With Illustrations 21s net